

MISDEMEANANT PROBATIONERS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE SEVERITY OF THE
CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

By

SASKIA DANIELE SANTOS

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2011

© 2011 Saskia Daniele Santos

To my parents, Rob French, and S.A. Santos

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank Jodi Lane for all the time and energy she has spent on me over the course of the last six years. Without her mentorship and support, I would have not been able to complete graduate school. I am grateful to her and feel lucky to have had her as my mentor. I would also like to thank Lon Lanza-Kaduce for all his support through the years; he also helped by pushing me to see other points of view. I would also like to acknowledge Joseph Spillane and Kenneth Wald for their time and expertise. Their knowledge greatly improved the quality of this project and enhanced my overall academic experience.

I would also like to thank Alachua County Court Services for graciously allowing me to do this project. I would especially like to thank Cyndi Morton and Sharon Longworth for being instrumental in ensuring that this project was a success. I am grateful to Kris Anderson, Valerie Green, Drew Gallagher, Amanda Mash, Wanda Mayberry, Wilfredo Melendez, Margie Nunez, Dana Patterson, Rodney Williams, and Nicole Wise for all of their help in recruiting. This project would not have been possible without them or the probationers who agreed to participate. I am also thankful for all the support and help I received from Tom Tonkavich and my Jail Population Management co-workers.

Katheryne Zambrana has been my co-researcher and friend throughout this process. Without her I would not have been able to survive the many hours of recruiting and interviewing. We were also lucky to have energetic research assistants who were willing to spend time helping us. I would like to acknowledge Joseph Tyler Dimaio, Elder Garcia, Jennifer Lee, Colin Murphy, Griffin Peters, Jacob Whitney, Nicole

Wolfman, and all the other wonderful research assistants who worked with us on this project.

I am blessed with a loving family. I want to thank my mother for all her support and patience. I am the person I am today because of her. I am also grateful for my father and Donna for their constant encouragement. They are always proud of me, and their unflagging support mean a lot. Alex and Kenna have been my cheerleaders throughout this experience. I am thankful for their support. I would also like to acknowledge Sherri DioGuardi. She has been there every step of the way with me. She has always been a tremendous support for me as well as a great friend. I am grateful to my friends and graduate school colleagues for their friendship.

Finally, I would like to thank my fiancé, Rob, for always believing in me and my abilities even when I do not. I am lucky to have such a kind, caring, and thoughtful person in my life. I love the man he is, and I am grateful for all that he adds to my life. He inspires me to be a better person. He and our boys -- Smoky, Trent, and Staley -- are my world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	11
ABSTRACT	14
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	16
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	21
Probation in the United States	21
Mission of Probation	23
Models of Probation	24
Probation Officers' Roles and Classifications	26
Probation Officers' Role Conflict.....	28
Probationers in the United States	32
Conditions and Violations of Probation	35
Technical Violations	38
Predictors of Probation Failure and Success.....	40
Severity Literature.....	43
Severity of the Conditions of Probation	44
Severity of Criminal Sanctions.....	46
Effect of Offender Characteristics.....	49
Race	49
Gender.....	51
Age	52
Offender type	53
Criminal justice experience	53
Offenders Versus Non-Offenders	55
Procedural Justice	57
Chapter Summary.....	61
3 METHODOLOGY	62
Context: Alachua County Probation.....	62
Sample Procedure and Recruitment.....	65
Target Population	65
Recruitment.....	67
Recruitment through the mail.....	68
Recruitment through the probation officers	68
Recruitment through follow-up letter	69
Recruitment through direct contact	70

Recruitment through follow-up phone calls	73
Data Collection	76
Official Data Collection	76
Self-Reported Data Collection: Face-to-Face Interviews.....	77
Prior to the interview	77
During the interview process.....	78
Post interview process	81
No show to the interview procedure	82
Measures	83
Official Data: Criminal History Form	83
Self-Reported Data: Interview Instrument.....	87
Variables.....	93
Dependent Variables.....	93
Research question 2a: Severity	93
Research question 2b: Difficulty.....	101
Research question 2c: Obstacles	108
Independent Variables	112
Personal characteristics variables.....	112
Previous criminal history variables.....	114
Current offense and probation sentence variables.....	117
Sample Characteristics	118
Response Rate.....	118
Interviewees	122
Personal characteristics.....	123
Juvenile justice system history.....	136
Adult justice system history.....	137
Current probation	141
Official Sample Description versus Self-Reporting Sample Description	143
Similarities.....	143
Differences.....	144
Random Sample Description versus Convenience Sample Description	147
Similarities.....	147
Differences.....	156
Analysis	157
Chapter Summary.....	159
4 RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 1—THE CONDITIONS OF PROBATION... 160	
Standard Conditions of Probation	160
Treatment Conditions of Probation	164
Additional Conditions of Probation.....	173
Additional Treatment Conditions	174
Additional Punitive Conditions	176
Chapter Summary.....	178

5	RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 2A— SEVERITY OF CONDITIONS.....	180
	Quantitative Analysis	180
	Percentages and Frequencies: Severity of Probation Conditions.....	180
	Mean scores	181
	Factor analysis-based scales.....	181
	Literature-based scales.....	186
	Summary of frequencies and percentages	190
	Correlations and Regressions: Severity of Probation Conditions	191
	Factor analysis-based scales.....	191
	Literature-based scales.....	200
	Summary of correlations and regressions.....	202
	Qualitative Analysis	203
	Standard Conditions of Probation.....	203
	Not severe.....	203
	Extremely severe	211
	Summary of standard conditions.....	215
	Treatment Conditions of Probation.....	215
	Not severe.....	215
	Extremely severe	219
	Summary of treatment conditions	221
	Punitive Conditions of Probation	221
	Not severe.....	221
	Extremely severe	227
	Summary of punitive conditions	233
	Chapter Summary.....	233
6	RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 2B— DIFFICULTY OF CONDITIONS.....	235
	Quantitative Analysis	235
	Percentages and Frequencies: Difficulty of Probation Conditions.....	235
	Mean scores	236
	Factor analysis-based scales.....	241
	Literature-based scales.....	244
	Correlations and Regressions: Difficulty of Probation Conditions.....	250
	Factor analysis-based scales.....	250
	Literature-based scales.....	259
	Qualitative Analysis	263
	Standard Conditions of Probation.....	264
	Not difficult	264
	Very difficult	271
	Summary of standard conditions.....	276
	Treatment Conditions of Probation.....	276
	Not difficult	276
	Very difficult	279
	Summary of treatment conditions	281
	Punitive Conditions of Probation	282

	Not difficult	282
	Very difficult	287
	Summary of punitive conditions	292
Overall	Difficulty of Probation.....	292
	Not difficult	293
	Relatively easy.....	294
	About 50/50.....	294
	Somewhat difficult.....	295
	Very difficult	296
	Summary of the overall difficulty of probation	297
Chapter	Summary.....	298
7	RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 2C— OBSTACLES OF PROBATION	301
	Quantitative Analysis	301
	Percentages and Frequencies: Obstacles for Completing Probation	301
	Mean scores	302
	Percentages and frequencies: Factor analysis-based scales	304
	Correlations and Regressions: Obstacles for Completing Probation.....	307
	Transportation-attendance obstacles scale	311
	Responsibility obstacle scale	311
	Tracking obstacle scale	312
	Punitive obstacles scale.....	313
	Living environment scale	315
	Summary of correlations and regressions.....	315
	Qualitative Analysis	316
	Potential Obstacles	316
	Financial obligations	316
	Community service hours.....	317
	Transportation.....	318
	Alcohol and/or drugs	319
	People, places and things.....	320
	Health conditions	320
	No Potential Obstacles	321
	Summary of Obstacles	322
Chapter	Summary.....	322
8	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	324
	Summary of Findings.....	324
	Comparison of Current Results to Previous Research.....	328
	Study Limitations	333
	Suggestions for Future Research	337
	Policy Implications	340
Chapter	Summary.....	344

APPENDIX

A	NOT INTERVIEWED CLASSIFICATION	345
B	LETTER TO PROBATIONERS.....	348
C	FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PROBATIONERS	349
D	CRIMINAL HISTORY FORM	350
E	INFORMED CONSENT	355
F	PROTECTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS	357
G	INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT	359
H	ANSWER CARD OPTIONS.....	383
I	NOT INTERVIEWED SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	385
J	PERCENTAGES AND FREQUENCIES BY SUBSAMPLE	394
K	CORRELATIONS	408
L	REGRESSIONS	434
	LIST OF REFERENCES	444
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	452

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
2-1 Probation estimates.....	33
3-1 Returned mail	68
3-2 Factor analysis for severity variables.....	95
3-3 Severity scales based on literature.....	99
3-4 Factor analysis for difficulty variables	103
3-5 Difficulty scales based on literature	107
3-6 Factor analysis for obstacles variables.....	109
3-7 Outcome rate categories	119
3-8 Rate estimates.....	121
3-9 Origin of information	123
3-10 Sample description based on official data	125
3-11 Sample description based on self-report data	131
3-12 Official sample description versus self-reported sample description	145
3-13 Random sample versus convenience sample description based on official data	149
4-1 Standard conditions based on official data versus self-report data.....	161
4-2 Treatment conditions based on official data versus self-report data.....	165
4-3 Punitive conditions based on official data versus self-report data	170
4-4 Additional conditions based on official data versus self-report data	175
5-1 Percentages for severity scales based on factor analysis	182
5-2 Percentages for severity scales based on literature	187
5-3 Correlations of severity scales and personal characteristics variables.....	193
5-4 Correlations of severity scales and previous criminal history variables	194

5-5	Correlations of severity scales and current offense and probation sentence variables	195
5-6	Predicting conditions of probation's severity- factor analysis-based scales.....	197
5-7	Predicting conditions of probation's severity- literature-based scales.....	201
5-8	Standard conditions of probations' qualitative themes.....	205
5-9	Treatment conditions of probations' qualitative themes.....	218
5-10	Punitive conditions of probations' qualitative themes	222
6-1	Percentages for difficulty scales based on factor analysis.....	238
6-2	Percentage for difficulty scales and variable based on the literature	246
6-3	Correlations of difficulty scales and personal characteristics variables	252
6-4	Correlations of difficulty scales/variable and previous criminal history variables	253
6-5	Correlations of difficulty scales/variable and current offense and probation sentence variables.....	254
6-6	Predicting conditions of probation's difficulty- factor analysis-based scales	255
6-7	Predicting conditions of probation's difficulty- literature-based scales	261
6-8	Standard conditions of probations' qualitative themes.....	266
6-9	Treatment conditions of probations' qualitative themes.....	277
6-10	Punitive conditions of probations' qualitative themes	283
6-11	Overall difficulty of probation sentences' qualitative themes	293
7-1	Percentages for obstacles scales based on factor analysis	303
7-2	Correlations of obstacles scales and personal characteristics variables	308
7-3	Predicting obstacle of probation	313
7-4	Qualitative themes of the obstacles for probation.....	316
8-1	Condition continuum based on <i>extremely severe</i> responses percentages.....	326
8-2	Condition continuum based on <i>very difficult</i> responses percentages	341

A-1	Sample classifications	345
I-1	Not interviewed sample description of based on official data	385
I-2	Not interviewed sample description of based on official data- refused	388
I-3	Not interviewed sample description of based on official data- ineligible	391
J-1	Percentages for severity scales based on factor analysis by subsample	394
J-2	Percentage for severity scales and variables based on the literature by group	397
J-3	Percentages for difficulty scales based on factor analysis by subsample.....	400
J-4	Percentage for difficulty scales and variables based on the literature by group	404
J-5	Percentages for obstacles scales based on factor analysis by group.....	406
K-1	Correlations of severity scales and personal characteristics variables	408
K-2	Correlations of severity scales and previous criminal history variables	412
K-3	Correlations of severity scales and current offense and probation sentence variables	416
K-4	Correlations of difficulty scales and personal characteristics variables	420
K-5	Correlations of difficulty scales/variables and previous criminal history variables	424
K-6	Correlations of difficulty scales/variables and current offense and probation sentence variables.....	427
K-7	Correlations of obstacles scales and personal characteristics variables	431
K-8	Correlations of obstacles scales and previous criminal history variables	432
K-9	Correlations of obstacles scales and current offense and probation sentence variables	433
L-1	Predicting perceived severity- total models	434
L-2	Predicting perceived difficulty- total model	438
L-3	Predicting obstacles- total models.....	442

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

MISDEMEANANT PROBATIONERS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE SEVERITY OF THE
CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

By

Saskia Daniele Santos

August 2011

Chair: Jodi Lane

Major: Criminology, Law and Society

Probation is a court-ordered disposition that places the adjudicated offender under the control, supervision and care of correctional or court supervision in lieu of incarceration, while the probation conditions form a contract with the court by which an offender must abide in order to remain in the community (Petersilia, 1997, 1998).

Though current estimates place over a million individuals on probation, the research is limited on the specific probation conditions imposed and the perceptions and effects of those conditions. Research focused on comparing offenders' perceptions of various type of criminal justice sanctions suggests that offenders' experiences with the criminal justice system, as well as their personal characteristics, influence their perceptions of the punitiveness or severity of criminal sanctions (May & Wood, 2010). The purpose of this research is to conduct research in an area that has been traditionally ignored by researchers.

Using both quantitative and qualitative data, this project examined perceptions of probation and probation conditions from the perspectives of 202 current misdemeanor probationers. Participants responded to questions measuring perceptions of probation conditions' severity and difficulty, as well as questions pertaining to potential obstacles

for them successfully completing probation. Official criminal, court, and probation records were also included in that analysis. Frequencies were run to examine participants' agreement with survey items and linear regression models were also estimated to identify possible predictors of agreement with survey items. Content analysis was performed on the qualitative data.

Probationers' perceptions of their conditions of probation are that probation conditions are typically not severe. Additionally, probationers consider the perceived severity of probation conditions when identifying the perceived difficulty of adhering to or completing probation conditions; the majority of probation conditions were perceived as being not difficult. The majority of listed obstacles were not viewed as obstacles by the probationers for them successfully completing their probation sentences, though this study identified six common obstacles: affording financial obligations, completing the community service hours, finding transportation to various probation conditions' locations, avoiding alcohol and/or drugs, avoiding particular people, places and things and current health conditions.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Probation is a court-ordered disposition that places the adjudicated offender under the control, supervision and care of correctional or court supervision in lieu of incarceration (Petersilia, 1998a). The conditions of probation form a contract with the court by which an offender must abide in order to remain in the community (Petersilia, 1997). Probation is based on the philosophy that some offenders have the ability to redeem themselves and become productive members of society (Silverman, 1993). Additionally, incarceration may be too severe of a sentence for some types of offenses and offenders. Today, probation is the most utilized criminal sanction in the United States (Applegate, Smith, Sitren & Springer, 2009; Petersilia, 1998a).

Between 1980 and the late 1990s, the number of individuals on probation more than doubled (Olson, Weisheit, & Ellsworth, 2001). By yearend 2009, there were an estimated 4,203,967 individuals on probation, which is roughly equivalent to about 1,799 per every 100,000 adults. This is a 0.9% decrease from the previous year and the first decrease since 1980, when the Bureau Justice of Statistics (BJS) began to annually collect probation statistics (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010). Within the State of Florida, there were 267,738 individuals on probation by yearend 2009, which is roughly equivalent to about 1,841 probationers per 100,000 adult Floridians. Florida is the fourth largest state in terms probationers under supervision (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010).

Despite the fact that over four million people are sentenced to probation, it is severely underfunded and understaffed (Fin, 1984; Kleiman et al., 2003; Petersilia, 1995, 1997; Silverman, 1993). Nationally, community corrections, which includes probation, receives roughly 10% of the state and local funding that institutional

corrections does, though two out of three people under correctional supervision are under community corrections' supervision (Petersilia, 1998a). The lack of funding has led to an increase in probation officers' caseloads. The 1967 President's Crime Commission recommended that probation caseloads ideally should be thirty offenders for every one probation officer. However, the national average is approximately 150 offenders for every one probation officer (Petersilia, 1995). Today some officers carry a caseload of 4,000 offenders (Jones & Kerbs, 2007).

In addition to being underfunded and understaffed, probation has also been understudied. The research examining probation has been limited, especially the research examining misdemeanor probation (MacKenzie, Browning, Skroban & Smith, 1999; May & Wood, 2010; Olson et al., 2001; Petersilia, 2002). The research examining probationers' perceptions of probation conditions and their severity is nearly non-existent. The research that has been conducted found that overall inmates felt that they would have little difficulty complying with various probation conditions (Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994b). However, the sample was composed of current inmates and not of individuals who were currently serving probation.

With probationers being the largest group of people under correctional supervision, it is imperative to understand how probation impacts offenders' lives. One way to do this is to examine the perceived severity of probation conditions (e.g., reporting requirements, drug tests, community service, paying fees) from a probationer's perspective. It is important to know probationers' perceptions of whether or not these conditions are reasonable and easy to follow and to know which ones they believe are more difficult or severe. If probationers believe that probation conditions are

difficult to follow, it might be that they are more likely to fail on probation. However, it is also possible that for conditions believed to be severe, probationers will make a greater effort to complete or adhere to them.

Some researchers have recommended that a theory of sentence severity be developed to provide a foundation for a sentencing system for both custodial and noncustodial sanctions (von Hirsch, Wasik & Greene, 1992). Such a theory of sentence severity should address what severity means and what factors may influence how sanctions are ranked (May & Wood, 2010; Sebba & Nathan, 1984; von Hirsch et al., 1992). Morris and Tonry (1990) argued for courts to use a continuum of correctional sanctions based on the premise that not all crimes and criminals deserve the most severe punishment (i.e., incarceration). Instead, they called for the development of a range of punishments, with upper boundary being imprisonment and lower boundary being probation. Severity can be determined by measuring the pain and/or discomfort from the offender's perspective (Morris & Tonry, 1990; von Hirsch et al., 1992).

Research conducted thus far on trying to develop a range of criminal sanctions based on offenders' perceptions of sanction severity revealed a complicated relationship where offenders' characteristics and experiences influence perceptions of severity (May & Wood, 2010; Spelman, 1995). The assumption that probation and prison lie on separate sides of a continuum has been challenged by research findings. Since sanctions that are alternative to incarceration are being utilized more often, it is important for policy-makers to understand offenders' perceptions on how the alternative sanctions' severity compare to incarceration. Using a theory of sentence severity, it might be possible to find sanctions that are as punitive as prison but do not carry the

financial burdens that mass incarceration does (May & Wood, 2010). The research has yet to be fully expanded to the conditions of probation. With so many offenders being placed on probation, it is possible that some conditions are perceived to be more severe than others. There may be a continuum of conditions in regards to severity.

The purpose of this study is to examine whether there is a severity continuum for conditions of probation and to determine whether perceived difficulty in completion and adherence to conditions influence conditions' severity. In this study individuals currently sentenced to misdemeanor supervised probation in Alachua County, Florida were interviewed regarding their current conditions of probation and their perceptions of condition severity and ability to adhere to them. This research hopes to answer the following research questions:

RQ 1: What are the conditions of probation that clients face in Alachua County?

RQ 2: What are probationers' perceptions of their conditions of probation?

RQ 2a: Specifically, do the conditions of probation fall on a continuum when it comes to severity? If so, which conditions are viewed as being most severe?

RQ 2b: Do probationers' views of the severity of a condition impact their perceived ability to complete a particular probation condition?

RQ 2c: What do probationers see as potential obstacles that would hinder them from completing or adhering to the conditions of their probation?

With the majority of probation agencies' caseloads being composed of misdemeanor probationers (Clear, Harris & Baird, 1992), this research makes a contribution to the literature by examining the understudied topic of probation (Petersilia, 1997), and more specifically misdemeanor probation, which focuses on the more common, less serious offender. Additionally, this research contributes to the very limited literature that has examined offenders' view of the severity of probation

conditions by interviewing individuals who currently are on probation which prior research has failed to do. By shedding light on how current probationers view their conditions of probation and their perceptions of possible obstacles for adhering and completing their term of probation, this research contributes by allowing for policy recommendations that may help in reducing the likelihood of individuals violating the terms of their probation due to a technical violation.

This paper answers the research questions by first highlighting relevant, prior research and discussing the methods used in the study. Next, the results are presented, first by focusing on Research Question 1. Research Question 2 is answered in three chapters; Chapter 5 addresses the sub-question about perceptions of severity, Chapter 6 addresses the sub-question about perceptions of difficulty, while Chapter 7 addresses the sub-questions about potential obstacles probationers are facing. The final chapter of this paper summarizes the results, discusses the study's limitations and recommends policy.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Though not in great quantity, research on perceptions of the severity of criminal sanctions among offenders has been a research topic for several decades. Research on probationers has also occurred for a number of years. However, research examining perceptions of the severity of probation conditions specifically is sparse, and no research has examined the perceptions of current probationers on the severity of probation conditions. Yet, this is an important issue because perceptions of condition severity may be important in predicting the chances of a person violating his or her probation. This literature review addresses three elements of relevant prior research: 1) who is placed on probation, 2) who violates probation, and 3) perceptions of severity, both of probation conditions and criminal sanctions more generally. First however, probation within the United States and the mission of probation are discussed. The last section discusses Procedural Justice and probation.

Probation in the United States

Modern day probation has its historical roots in three common law practices: benefit of clergy, reprieve and recognizance (Greenberg, 1981). The practice of benefit of clergy allowed clerks, monks and nuns to escape punishment in secular courts. Later, this practice was extended to secular clerks and individuals who were able to read. Though it allowed individuals to escape punishment for some crimes, not all crimes were covered by benefit of clergy. The practice of reprieve, on the other hand, allowed courts to temporarily suspend a person's sentence, giving the person time to appeal. Though benefit of clergy and reprieve were precursors to probation, they are not

considered to be direct ancestors or equivalents to modern day probation (Greenberg, 1981).

The practice of recognizance is considered to be a direct ancestor of probation. Recognizance entailed the offender promising to keep the peace and based on the offender's promise the court would release the offender from custody. A third party would act as a surety and was obligated to enforce the offender's oath of keeping the peace. If the offender violated the pledge, the surety was required to return the offender to the court. This practice led to the first probation service in England and was first adopted in the United States in Massachusetts in 1841 by John Augustus (Greenberg, 1981).

Often thought of as the "Father of Modern Probation," Augustus posted bail for those being charged as common drunks and asked the judge to postpone sentencing for several weeks and place the offenders into his custody. Once the probationary period was over, Augustus would report to the judge whether the person had been reformed. If the offender could convince the judge of his reform, the offender would receive only a small fine (Petersilia, 1997, 1998a). By the end of his career in 1858, Augustus had bailed out 1,946 individuals, who originally were limited to drunkards but eventually included other types of criminals (Greenberg, 1981).

Augustus is also credited with being the first to use the term probation, a derivative of the Latin term *probation*, which means a period of proving or trial (Petersilia, 1997). The origins for presentence investigations, conditions of probation, and revocation of probation came from Augustus' innovative work. Additionally, his work was the key impetus behind the adoption of the first probation statute (Greenberg, 1981). In 1878,

roughly twenty years after Augustus' death, Massachusetts adopted the first juvenile probation laws. By 1954, all states had passed juvenile probation laws (Petersilia, 1998a). With Mississippi being the last state, by 1956, all states passed adult probation laws (Petersilia, 1998a; Silverman, 1993). With its roots in the common law practices and Augustus' work, probation is now the most commonly court-ordered criminal sanction within the United States (Applegate et al., 2009; Petersilia, 1998a).

Mission of Probation

Though many current probation practices were shaped and formed from the historical development of probation, the confusion regarding the mission of probation can in part also be traced to probation's historical roots. The purpose of probation and the role of probation officers has long been a source of debate, and probation organizations have been plagued with vague objectives and a lack of consensus about the role of probation officers (Blackmore, 1981; Czajkoski, 1965; Van Laningham, Taber & Dimants, 1966). Following Augustus at the turn of the century, probationer officers often came from one of two backgrounds. They either came from a law enforcement background or from a social work one (Lindner & Savarese, 1984). This still exists today, and individuals working within probation agencies often have different perspectives about their role, whether it is solely to protect society or to rehabilitate offenders. At the organizational level there is little agreement about whether probation should function as a surveillance agency or a service agency or both. Little thought has been given to the operating philosophy of probation agencies (Czajkoski, 1965) and none has been given to how poorly agency's objectives and probationer officers' roles may influence probationers' perceptions of probation.

Models of Probation

Historically, the main philosophy of probation was to befriend and aid the probationer as a way to rehabilitate the offender (Aldridge & Eadie, 1997). With the increase in felony probationers and the public's lack of confidence in the correctional system's ability to rehabilitate offenders including probationers, the main philosophy of probation shifted to one that emphasizes control and supervision of probationers (Harris, Clear & Baird, 1989; Petersilia, 1985; Rosecrance, 1987; Sigler & McGraw, 1984). The objective of assistance and treatment diminished while a new importance on surveillance emerged (Harris et al., 1989). Probation officers went from doing casework to focusing on technical violations (Whitehead & Braswell, 2000). However, the goal of rehabilitation has not entirely vanished, leaving probation agencies and probation officers the difficult role of protecting the community by rehabilitating of probationers (Holgate & Clegg, 1991; Miles, 1965).

Probation's mission is often seen as having two key functions which are on opposite sides of the continuum: encourage offenders to reform themselves and supervise offenders in order to prevent further criminal behavior (Blackmore, 1981). The organizational conditions of the probation agency dictate if and which goal takes priority (Glaser, 1969; Ohlin et al., 1956; O'Leary & Duffee, 1971; Lawrence, 1984; Tomaino, 1975; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1992). Depending on which goal takes priority, the model of probation typically is either a rehabilitation model or a law enforcement model (Duffee & O'Leary, 1986; Whitehead & Braswell, 2000). The rehabilitation model has also been referred to as the welfare model as well as the therapeutic model (Glaser, 1969; Klockars, 1972). Probation officers are to have a high concern for the probationer and a low concern for the community. His or her role is to mentor and

assist the probationer in whatever way he or she can (Whitehead & Braswell, 2000). The law enforcement model is also known as the punitive model or the reform model (Duffee & O'Leary, 1986; Glaser, 1969; Whitehead & Braswell, 2000). The goals of this model are to deter both the probationer and would-be offenders' through more punishment. Additionally, probation is to incapacitate and limit the probationer's opportunity for committing crimes (Whitehead & Braswell, 2000).

Though the mission of probation is often thought of as being based on a rehabilitation model or being based on a law enforcement model, other missions based on other models have emerged. Some suggest that probation now functions as a managerial model. A probation agency's success is measured by the office's ability to manage large caseloads successfully (Simon, 1993). Another model that has been suggested is the public safety model, where the focus is solely on punishment and public safety. Probation offices attempt to identify naturally occurring guardians in the probationer's life (Smith & Dickey, 1999). While the public's safety is the main concern in the public safety model, under the restorative and community justice model the focus is on the victim, community and offender. Often the victims are not included in probation models, but through this model the victim is included through conditions such as restitution and victim-offender mediation (Feeley & Simon, 1992). Though some models have diverged from the two traditional models of probation, most probation offices continue to subscribe a rehabilitative model or a law enforcement model.

Some probation agencies use a balanced approach which combines the two models. They have elements take from the rehabilitation model such as assessing a probationer's issues and attempting to address is via appropriate services. From the

law enforcement model, the probationers are held accountable. Some also include elements from the restorative justice model by emphasizing the victim. By combining the models it borrows the positive element from each. Unfortunately the combination also borrows the limitations of each model (Feeley & Simon, 1992). Additionally the contradiction between the rehabilitation model and law enforcement model is still present. Under the rehabilitative model there is an assumption of determinism, which is why the focus is on providing services and rehabilitating the offender. This contradicts the assumption of the law enforcement model which assumes free-will and therefore emphasizes the need for accountability (Feeley & Simon, 1992). This contradiction of the balanced approach allows agencies' missions to continue to remain unclear as they do their daily practice of probation.

Even if a probation office has adopted a particular model, there are variations across the agencies who adopted the same model (Weiss & Wozner, 2002). In other words, those probation offices that subscribe to a law enforcement model have variations among themselves. The presence of different models and the variation among those models contributes to the lack of agreement about the purpose of probation. The confusion regarding the mission of probation has led to probation agencies having vague objectives (Blackmore, 1981; Czajkoski, 1965; Van Laningham et al., 1966).

Probation Officers' Roles and Classifications

The role of a probation officer in its basic form is to ensure that the offender is complying with the court ordered probation (Hardman, 1960). However, with the mission of probation not clearly defined, there is also a lack of consensus about how probation officers can best achieve that role. As was the case with probation agencies,

most probation officers' roles fall along the continuum between service and surveillance. The debate centers on whether the probation officer's role is to ensure compliance by enforcing one's probation or to assist the probationer via services (Clear & Latessa, 1993; Lawrence, 1984; Tomaino, 1975). The role that a specific probation officer adopts is based on his or her personal philosophy and/or the organizational policies of the probation agency the probation officer works for (Clear & Latessa, 1993). Since there is not one specific role adopted by all probation officers, over time probation officers have developed different styles of managing their probationers based on the role they identify with the most. The multiple styles that were developed allowed for the classification of probation officers based on the role he or she adopts.

Most classification systems were created based on where the work style fell on the continuum between service and surveillance. The earliest categories are the three created by Ohlin, Piven and Pappenfort (1956): punitive, protective agent and welfare worker. A punitive officer sees his or her role as enforcing conformity and protecting society from the probationer. A protective agent sees his or her role as protecting the probationer and the community. A welfare worker officer sees his or her role focusing on the probationer's needs and well-being and aims to help the probationer adjust to the community. Glaser (1969) had similar categories in that he had a punitive and welfare role. However, a probation officer who sees his or her role as both high in assisting and controlling probationers were classified as a paternal officer. A probation officer who is low in both areas was classified as a passive officer (Glaser, 1969). Glaser's classification remains present in the literature but the terminology has been changed from assistance and control to service and surveillance (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1992).

Other classification system for probation officers (e.g., Klockars, 1972; Raynor, 1985; Spica, 1977; Whitehead, 1990) were created but most are similar to previous classifications developed or the “new” classifications could be subsumed under another classification.

As previously stated, most probation officers identify their role as falling somewhere between being more service-oriented or more surveillance-oriented. Research has shown that those with a master’s of social work degree, females and those with higher income levels tend to be more likely to embrace a rehabilitative role and see a probation officer’s job to be more service-oriented (Anderson & Spanier, 1980; Brennan & Khinduka, 1970). Early research concluded that probation officers were more likely to agree about importance of some of the social work aspects of their jobs, while there was little agreement about the importance about some of the law enforcement aspects of the job (Van Laningham et al., 1966). This might indicate that more would have been classified under welfare/service categories. Recent research has concluded probation officers are moving away from embracing the treatment philosophy of probation with more probation officers placing themselves on the law enforcement side of the continuum (Harris et al., 1989; Sigler & McGraw, 1984). Perhaps, modern probation officers would be more likely to fall into punitive/surveillance categories than in the past.

Probation Officers’ Role Conflict

Role conflict can occur when a person is expected to perform two or more roles simultaneously though the roles are contrary to each other (Tomaino, 1975). In the case of probation officers, it is often argued that the two most common roles expected for them to perform cause role conflict. The role of enforcing probation conditions (i.e.,

law enforcement) is viewed as being counter to the role of assisting the probationer in rehabilitation and successful community adjustment (i.e., social worker) (Clear & Latessa, 1993; Lawrence, 1984; Tomaino, 1975). With the mission of probation not being clearly defined, probation officers are expected to find a way of integrating the two roles, conflicting or not.

Experiencing role conflict is believed to lead to job burnout, which is the psychological withdrawal from work as a response to extreme stress and/or job dissatisfaction (Whitehead, 1989; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1992). Role conflict is also believed to lead to emotional exhaustion (Holgate & Clegg, 1991). Due to the lack of consensus about the mission of probation, probation officers might also suffer from role ambiguity in addition to job burnout and emotion exhaustion. With their role not being clearly defined, it may be difficult for them to be certain as to which goals need to be achieved. The lack of goal achievement may lead to the lack of personal accomplishment (Holgate & Clegg, 1991). The negative effects of role conflict are likely to lead to job turnover. In addition to probation officers experiencing role conflict due to the conflicting roles of law enforcer and social worker, the public is unclear on how to evaluate probation and probation officers (Ohlin et al., 1956; Van Laningham et al., 1966). This may lead to criticisms or a lack of public support furthering the stress and emotional exhaustion suffered by probation officers. With the roles of probation officer being thought of as incompatible, the issue of role conflict is very present in probation literature.

Interestingly, though probation officers' role conflict is a basic assumption, there has been little attempt to directly measure role conflict among probation officers. The

limited amount of research that has been conducted showed that probation officers experience a low level of role conflict (Hardman, 1960; Sigler & McGraw, 1984). Some estimate that 10 to 20% of probation officers experience emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, which was mainly contributed to role conflict (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1985). However, most research suggests that the social worker role and law enforcer role are not incompatible (Clear & Latessa, 1993; Studt, 1978). Probation officers do not necessarily see the investigation and supervision of probationers as being distinct from providing and helping in treatment (Czajkoski, 1969). Perhaps the argument that probation officers experience role conflict might be overstated.

A probation officer may avoid role conflict by placing an emphasis on one orientation over the other (Clear & Latessa, 1993). One's probation style tends to be somewhat mutually exclusive towards law enforcement or rehabilitation and therefore there is no conflict about having to perform two contrary roles (Tomaino, 1975). A probation officer may also avoid role conflict by shifting from role to role depending on the circumstances (Hardman, 1960). Most probation officers learn to develop an adaptive approach where he or she chooses whether to be a law enforcer or a social worker depending the probationer's behavior or situation (McCleary, 1978). Even if a probation officer subscribes to a particular style, he or she must understand and invoke the other philosophy from time to time (Bates, 1960). Probation officers appear to be able to play both roles with little difficulty and avoid possible role conflict.

Despite evidence suggesting that most probation officers do not experience role conflict, some probation agencies have attempted to resolve role conflict by implementing a team concept of probation supervision (Barkdull, 1976; Whitehead &

Lindquist, 1992). One member of the team emphasizes the law enforcement role, while the other the social worker role (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1992). Other variations of team supervision have one member emphasize surveillance, one member aid employment, education, vocational, housing and financial matters and a third member help with marital, family and other personal issues (Barkdull, 1976). The hope is for reduce any potential role conflict probation officers may experience by limiting their role to only one.

If role conflict exists, probation officers do not have a monopoly on it. Other professions require that a person to play sometime contrary roles. Yet in those professions eliminating professional tasks is not seen as an option (Clear & Latessa, 1993). The field of probation is one of the few professions that advocates for getting rid of one role or the other, although research does not support the argument that role conflict is a major concern. Nevertheless, any role conflict that can or does occur is due to lack of clarity about the goal and mission of probation.

A probationer's perception about his or her conditions of probation may be affected by which model a probation agency and role his or her probation officer adopts. It is possible that agencies that focus more on the control of the offenders versus the care of offenders are seen as more punitive which may affect how severe a probationer finds his or her conditions to be. In addition to influencing a probationer's perception of severity, an agency's adopted philosophy and the probation officer's roles could influence how difficult the probationer perceives his or her conditions of probation are to comply with or to complete. If a probationer considers his or her probation officer's role to be strictly enforcement, the probationer may consider the probation sentence more difficult to complete than a probationer whose probation officer adopted more of a

service-oriented philosophy and aids the probationer in successfully navigating any obstacles he or she faces during the course of his or her probation sentence. Due to the criminal sanction of probation having a vague mission statement and poorly defined goals and objectives, probation agencies and probationer officers adopt various philosophies and roles. These varying philosophies and roles may influence probationers' perceptions of probation.

Probationers in the United States

As previously mentioned, at yearend 2009 there were over four million individuals on probation in the United States. Historically, a higher percentage of probationers have been White. In 1997, Petersilia reported that roughly 64% were White and 34% were Black. More recent estimates are that 55% of probationers are White and 30% are Black. Additionally, 13% identify as being Hispanic (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010) (Table 2-1). Women only make up 24% of the nation's probationers, while men make up 76% of the population (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010). This is a 4% increase in women probationers (Petersilia, 1997a), but men still out-number women probationers three to one.

The characteristics of male and female probationers significantly differ. The average age of the female probationers was one year older than male probationers. Female probationers also were more likely to be of lower income and were less likely to be employed than male probationers. Male probationers were more likely to have prior criminal histories and more extensive substance abuse histories than their female counterparts. There were also differences among the type of offenses, with women being more likely to have been placed on probation for property or drug offenses. Men

were more likely to have been convicted and placed on probation for a violent crime (Olson, Lurigio & Seng, 2000).

Table 2-1. Probation estimates

	National		Florida	
	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Probationers	4,203,967		267,738	
Race				
White	1,483,180	55	132,559	57
Black	804,591	30	63,681	27
Hispanic	362,156	13	34,906	15
Other	53,374	2	2,047	1
Gender				
Female	740,253	24	63,738	25
Male	2,342,640	76	189,435	75
Offense level				
Felony	1,665,216	51	171,506	66
Misdemeanor	1,530,520	47	87,163	33
Other	77,445	2	1,591	1
Type of Offense				
Public Order Offense	404,834	26	3,6544	24
Drug	582,759	26	54,498	33
Property	575,360	18	76,267	16
Violent	426,344	19	42,361	19
Other	213,745	10	18,808	8

Estimates taken from Bureau of Justice Statistics' *Probation and parole in the United States, 2009* report

Approximately 47% of probationers are on probation for misdemeanors, and 51% are for felonies (Table 2-1). Twenty-six percent are classified as drug offenders, 26% as property offenders, and 18% as public-order offenders. Public-order offenses include driving while intoxicated and other traffic offenses. Nineteen percent of the nation's probationers are classified as violent offenders (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010), which is a slight increase over the previously reported number of 16% several years earlier (Mayzer, Gray, & Maxwell, 2004; Petersilia, 1995). The southern region of the United States has more individuals on probation than any other region (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010;

Petersilia, 1997a). The South had approximately 1,997 individuals on probation per 100,000 adults by yearend 2009, with Georgia having the most at 5,385 per 100,000 adults. However, Texas has the largest number of adult probationers in the country with 426,331 individuals (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010).

Examining Florida specifically, it is fourth in terms of the number of individuals on probation, behind Texas, Georgia and California, respectively. The most recent estimates report 267,738 adults are on probation in Florida, which is equivalent to one in every fifty-four adults. Of those on probation in Florida, 95% were sentenced to solely to probation. Roughly 4% of the probationers received a sentence of incarceration in addition to their sentence of probation. Of those serving a sentence of probation in Florida, approximately 57% are White, 27% are Black and 15% are Hispanic. Fewer than 1% is identified as being American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or being of two or more races (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010) (Table 2-1). In the State of Florida, females roughly compose 25% of the population, while males compose 75% of the population (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010). Once again, this equates to three male probationers to every one female probationer. The estimates of the race and ethnic origin and gender of Florida's probationers appear to be similar to the national estimates.

Florida appears to have a higher percentage of individuals who are on probation for felonies than the nation's average. Approximately 33% of Florida's probationers were sentenced to probation for misdemeanors, while 68% were for felonies (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010) (Table 2-1). This is roughly 15% more felony probationers than the national average. Twenty-four percent of Florida's probationers were classified as drug

offenders, 35% as property offenders and 16% as public-order offenders. Nineteen percent of Florida's probationers were violent offenders, which included those sentenced to probation for domestic violence and sex offenses (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010). Florida appears to have more property offenders and slightly fewer drug offenders on probation than the national average.

Conditions and Violations of Probation

The conditions of a person's probation forms a contract between the court and the offender, in which he or she agrees to complete or adhere to the probation terms in order to remain in the community. The conditions that the offender is required to complete or adhere to typically fall into one of three categories of conditions: standard, treatment, and punitive. Standard conditions are the conditions that are imposed on all the probationers under that supervision agency (e.g., not leaving the jurisdiction without permission and notifying the agency of any changes in address) (Clarke, 1979; Petersilia, 1997a). Treatment conditions are conditions specific to the individual and require the person to address a problem (e.g., substance abuse) or need (e.g., vocational training). Punitive conditions are conditions imposed on a person in order to reflect the seriousness of his or her offense. These conditions are meant to increase the invasiveness and punitiveness of probation (e.g., victim restitution, community service, and house arrest) (Petersilia, 1997a).

Though the probationer's constitutional rights may be restricted while being on probation, it does not mean the probationer forfeits all his or her constitutional protections (Levin, 1983). *Morrissey v. Brewer* (1972) requires that due process be

applied to parole revocation hearings¹ (Fisher, 1977; Greenberg, 1981). In this case, the Supreme Court held that a parolee facing revocation of parole needs to be given two hearings. The first should be a preliminary hearing where it is determined whether there is probable cause to believe that the offender violated his or her parole conditions. The second hearing is the final revocation hearing. *Gagnon v. Scarpelli* (1973) applied this standard to probationers facing revocation of probation (Fisher, 1977; Greenberg, 1981).

A probationer can break his or her contract with the court (i.e., probation) in one of two ways. Probation can be violated if a person commits a technical violation, which is when an individual violates the conditions of his or her probation other than committing a new law violation. A person can also have his or her probation violated by committing a new law violation. Law violations have been categorized as either minor or major. Minor violations constitute an arrest or conviction for a minor offense where the punishment of such a conviction would be imprisonment for ninety days or less. Major violations are arrests and convictions for a criminal offense where the punishment if convicted would be more than ninety days (Bork, 1995).

Though a person violates his or her conditions of probation including committing new law violations, he or she can sometimes still successfully complete his or her probation term. A violation may result in the probation officer deciding not to officially violate the person's probation or the probationer's probation status being reinstated by a judge (Taxman & Cherkos, 1995). However, a violation can also lead to the person

¹ Despite parole and probation often being used interchangeable, they are different. Parole implies that the offender served a portion of his or her sentence incarcerated and is being released prior to completing the full sentence. Probation is a sentencing disposition and is often used as an alternative to incarceration (Petersilia, 2002).

being unsuccessfully discharged from probation. This is when a judge sentences the probationer to another punishment and his or her former probation sentence is terminated or revoked.

Successful completion or discharge from probation entails completing the full-term of one's probation sentence or receiving an early discharge. National estimates place the successful completion rate of probation in 2009 at 65%. Within the State of Florida the rate of successful completion is estimated to be 57% (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010). Smaller studies support the findings that the majority of probationers successfully complete their term of probation, with some estimates being as high as 75% being in compliance (Clear et al., 1992; Minor, Wells & Sims, 2003; Taxman, 1995). Other studies estimate that one-fourth to one-half of probationers comply with their probation conditions (Bork, 1995; Gray, Fields & Maxwell, 2001; Taxman & Cherkos, 1995; Taxman, 1995).

Though most probationers will successfully complete their term of probation, there is some research that suggests the contrary. A classic RAND study that examined felony probationers in California estimated that 65% of those sampled were rearrested during a forty-month follow up. Fifty-one percent were eventually reconvicted of a new crime (or crimes), with 34% being reincarcerated. Only a minority (35%) of the felony probationers successfully completed probation without incident (Petersilia, 1985). However, studies have not been able to replicate these findings and instead find that most probationers comply (McClelland, & Alpert, 1985), so California may be a unique case.

Some of the differences in estimates of probationers who successfully (or non-successfully) completed probation may be due to researchers failing to distinguish between misdemeanants and felons. When using rearrest as the measure of probation failure, researchers concluded that most misdemeanants complete their probation while many felons do not complete probation (Petersilia, 1997a). Roughly three-quarters of misdemeanor probationers are estimated to successfully complete probation (Petersilia, 1997b). Nearly half (46%) of those on felony probation are classified as failures, with 54% being arrested at least once (Petersilia, 1995). However, an examination of New York's probation population indicated that 35% of the misdemeanor probationers had received a violation within the first six months of their sentence, and 61% had done so within one year. Only 24% of the felony probationers received a violation during the six months of their probation and 45% did so within the first year (New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, 2007). It remains to be seen if the differences in estimates are due to the type of offender (i.e., misdemeanor versus felons), but it appears that regardless of the sample, the majority of those on probation will complete their term of probation.

Technical Violations

As previously mentioned, a person can violate his or her probation either by committing a new law violation or committing a technical violation. These violations can be categorized into three categories: most serious violations, medium serious violations and least serious violations. The first category, most serious violation, encompasses new law violations and absconding² (Gary et al., 2001). Violations that are considered

² Absconding is when a probationer has failed to repeatedly show up to required contacts with his or her probation officer and with whom the officer no longer has contact (Mayzer et al., 2004).

to be medium in terms of seriousness are ones such as failing to attend substance abuse or mental health treatment and failing a urinalysis test. The least serious violations include things such as failing to report to the probation office or committing a curfew violation (Gray et al., 2001). The majority of technical violations involve failure to report or failure to comply with treatment conditions (Maxwell et al., 1999).

Most of the violations that occur are technical (Bork, 1995; Clear et al., 1992; Gray et al., 2001, Maxwell, Gray & Bynum, 1999; Minor et al., 2003; Sims & Jones, 1997). Of those who commit a violation of probation, 24% committed a new law violation and 74% committed a technical violation (Gray et al., 2001). Some place the estimates lower, finding that only 13% of violations discovered are for new crimes (Maxwell et al., 1999; McClelland & Alpert, 1985). Twenty-six percent of those whose probation was revoked were due to technical violations (McClelland & Alpert, 1985).

One finding to the contrary was in New York City, where 16% of the cases were discharged because of new conviction while 12% were discharged due to a technical violation. However, when examining the county departments in New York State, only 6% of the probationers were discharged from probation due to a new conviction. Twenty-six percent was discharged due to a technical violation (New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, 2007). Most often, studies find that when individuals violate their probation it is due to technical violations. In some cases technical violations occur three times more often than violations that are classified as major (i.e., new law violations that could result in imprisonment longer than ninety days) (Bork, 1995). Violations that are serious are rare, and instead, violations tend to be technical or for minor offenses (Clear et al., 1992).

A possible contributor to probationers receiving more technical violations than new law violations is that the number of special conditions being placed on probationers has increased. These special conditions include required drug testing and treatment, as well as mandatory curfews, house arrest and employment. Judges are not only sentencing more probationers to split sentences (i.e., both an incarceration sentence and a probation sentence) but, more importantly, are increasing the number of conditions that probationers must adhere to or complete. As more conditions are placed on probationers the chances of them failing on probation increases (Taxman, 1995).

In terms of which conditions probationers appear to struggle with the most, one study estimated that 59% of those sampled received a violation for a dirty urinalysis test, while another indicated that more than 30% of the sample either failed to appear for drug testing or failed the test itself (Kleiman et al., 2003). Gray and his colleagues (2001) reported failure to report to be the most common type of violation and failing a drug test to be the second most common violation. While some may argue that focusing on new law violations is more important than focusing on technical violations, focusing on technical violations is just as important because they may be a signal that an offender is engaging in criminal behavior and can therefore serve as a proxy for criminal behavior (Petersilia & Turner, 1990). Additionally, of those that violate probation, most will do so due to a technical violation, and it appears that among technical violations, some conditions appear to be violated more often than others.

Predictors of Probation Failure and Success

As previously mentioned, studies have concluded that those on felony probation are more likely to violate than are those who are on probation for committing

misdemeanors (Petersilia, 1997a), but other factors also seem to affect how well one does while on probation. Studies show that Blacks are more likely to violate compared to Whites (Maxwell et al., 1999; McClelland & Alpert, 1985; Morgan, 1994). Minorities are also more likely to receive a technical violation (Gray et al., 2001). Males are twice as likely to be violated, despite females often having a greater number of risk factors for probation failure (e.g., lower income, higher unemployment) (McClelland & Alpert, 1985; Morgan, 1994; Norland & Mann, 1984; Olson et al., 2000). In one study, males were more likely to be violated for new felony charges while females were more likely to be violated technical reasons. In examining just technical violations, males were more likely violate due to failing to work, and females were more likely to be violated for hanging out with the wrong friends (Norland & Mann, 1984). Yet, more recent research showed no evidence of gender differences in probability of probation revocation or technical violations, although the study did find that the males were more likely to be arrested while on probation for a new law violation (Olson et al., 2000).

Age, education, and employment status have also been linked to probation success and failure. Younger offenders tend to be less successful on probation, and as age increases, so does success on probation (McClelland & Alpert, 1985; Morgan, 1994; Petersilia, 1997a). Less educated offenders were more likely to receive a technical violation while the probationers who had higher educational level were less likely to violate the terms of probation (Gray et al., 2001; Maxwell et al., 1999; McClelland & Alpert, 1985; Morgan, 1994). Employment status has been a predictor of probation failure/success. Those probationers who are unemployed were more likely to commit a new law violation while on probation (Gray et al., 2001; Petersilia, 1997a).

Having stable employment decreased the odds of a person violating his or her terms of probation (McClelland & Alpert, 1985; Morgan, 1994). Additionally, those serving probation in rural areas were less likely to violate their probation compared to those serving probation in an urban area (Olson et al., 2001). This may be in part due to rural agencies being more likely to handle low-risk cases, while large city departments are more likely to handle high-risk cases (Clear et al., 1992).

The research on marital status is mixed. Some studies concluded being married did decrease the odds of a person failing while on probation (McClelland & Alpert, 1985; Morgan, 1994). Previous research also indicated that those residing with a spouse, children or both were more successful on probation (Petersilia, 1997a), possibly meaning that co-residence is important to family impact. However, in more recent research a probationer's marital status, as well as the number of dependents he or she had, was not a significant predictor of either technical or new law violations (Gray et al., 2001).

Current offense and prior criminal history have been significant in predicting the likelihood of probation violations (Maxwell et al., 1999). Those serving probation for assaultive crimes have been shown to be more likely to commit a new crime (Gray et al., 2001). In some studies those serving a probation sentence for a property offense (when compared to robbery and drug offenders) were more likely to violate (Petersilia, 1997a). Those who had a history of substance use, especially heroin use, were more likely to violate probation than those who did not (Gray et al., 2001; Maxwell et al., 1999; Petersilia, 1997a). Lastly, the length of probation is a predictor of probation outcome, with the longer sentences being more likely to fail on probation (Morgan, 1994). In

summary, the majority of those serving a sentence of probation successfully complete probation. Those that do violate the conditions of their probation are more likely to violate due to a technical violation. There also appear to be other variables that are associated with probation outcome.

Severity Literature

Though the terms and conditions of probation allow the probationer to remain in the community, prosecutors, defense attorneys and judges may not always take great care when setting probation conditions or type of supervision. Once probation is ordered, the probation officer is expected to take over and ensure the probation conditions are adhered to and completed (Clarke, 1979). Yet, the appropriateness and severity of probation conditions may influence a person's ability to successfully complete the sentence. Studies find that if clients are assigned to the appropriate programming based on their risk level, they are more likely to complete the sentence (Palmer et al., 2009). This finding suggests that applying the wrong conditions may lead to an increased chance of one violating his or her conditions.

With a vague mission and no consensus about the purpose of probation, it is unclear whether a person's probation sentence is meant to rehabilitate, punish or rehabilitate and punish the person (Blackmore, 1981; Czajkoski, 1965; Van Laningham et al., 1966). It is unclear what the underlying purpose of probation conditions is. Despite the lack of clarity about the purpose for the conditions, it is necessary that the conditions also be reasonable in order for the probationer to comply. For example, an individual who have had difficulty maintaining employment throughout his or her life may struggle with a condition requiring him or her to maintain employment. In such cases, the person may feel that it will be difficult to complete probation or adhere to the

condition and find the sentence to be more severe than it would be otherwise. The literature examining an offender's views regarding the severity and difficulty of his or her probation conditions is sparse.

Severity of the Conditions of Probation

To date, only Petersilia and Deschenes (1994a, 1994b) have focused specifically on the perceived severity of probation conditions. The researchers, in a larger study designed to ask inmates to rank the severity of different types of criminal sanctions, asked forty-eight male inmates how hard it was to comply with different conditions of probation. The response options were: *not difficult (90% chance I could do it)*, *relatively easy (75% chance I could do it)*, *about 50/50 chance I could do it*, *somewhat difficult (25% chance I could do it)*, and *very difficult (10% chance I could do it)*. The conditions were: twenty hours per week of employment, pay \$100 fine, ten hours per week community service, one unannounced drug test per week (and no positives), make one to two visits per week to probation office, one to two unannounced home visits per week by probation officer, attend weekly outpatient alcohol/drug program, pay victim restitution, pay \$500 fine, pay \$20 per week supervision fee, and house arrest with twenty-four hour electronic monitoring. Additionally, the inmates were asked to rank the probation conditions overall.

Petersilia and Deschenes (1994b) concluded that the inmates believed they would have little difficulty complying with the conditions. The conditions of paying a \$100 fine and doing ten hours per week of community service were reported as the easiest conditions. House arrest with twenty-four hour electronic monitoring and \$20 per week supervision fee were seen as the most difficult conditions.

In general, there were no significant differences in background characteristics between those who indicated that the conditions of probation would be easy to comply with and those who perceived the conditions as being more difficult. The offender's race, marital status, parental status, employment history, prior prison experience and how safe he felt in prison was not significantly related to his perception of difficulty. The only significant difference was between those with no history of drug or alcohol use and those who had used. Those with no history reported that they would find it difficult to attend a weekly outpatient treatment program in comparison to users.

In addition to the inmates, Petersilia and Deschenes (1994a) asked thirty-eight individuals who worked for Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) or who worked for private agencies contracted by Minnesota DOC how hard they felt it would be for probationers to comply with conditions of probation. The staff were asked about the same thirteen conditions of the probation as were the inmates and were given the answer options of *not difficult (90% chance offender could do it)*, *relatively easy (75% chance offender could do it)*, *about 50/50 chance offender could do it*, *somewhat difficult (25% chance offender could do it)*, and *very difficult (10% chance offender could do it)*.

In comparison to the inmates, the staff was more likely to indicate all the conditions to be more difficult to adhere to or complete. However, the only statistically significant differences were the conditions of having to pay victim restitution, pay a \$100 fine, pay a \$500 fine, maintain twenty hours/week employment and the overall rating. The staff reported believing it was difficult for offenders to locate jobs and in turn comply with conditions related to financial payments, whereas the offenders reported believing employment would not be difficult to obtain. When asked to indicate how difficult

particular conditions would be to adhere to or complete, inmates generally indicated that the conditions were relatively easy and that there was a 75% chance of them completing the condition. Staff was more likely to indicate that the probation conditions were more difficult to comply with than did the inmates (Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a).

Though Petersilia and Deschenes (1994a, 1994b) are the only ones to research the perceived difficulty of specific conditions of probation, they sampled current inmates and asked them to imagine what it would be like to comply with probation conditions. They did not ask current probationers, or those actually facing the specific probation conditions, how hard the conditions were to adhere to or complete. The views of individuals currently experiencing the conditions may be significantly different than the views of individuals asked to imagine the experience. More studies are needed regarding the perceived severity of probation conditions and specifically studies sampling individuals currently experiencing the conditions.

Severity of Criminal Sanctions

Though the literature regarding the severity of probation is limited, the literature examining perceptions of severity of different types of criminal sanctions is more abundant, and thus far, the research conducted on offenders' perceptions of the severity of criminal sanctions has indicated the relationship to be complex (Flory, May, Minor & Wood, 2006; May & Wood, 2010). Findings from studies often challenge the long held belief that regular probation is at one extreme and incarceration is at the other in terms of severity (May & Wood, 2010).

When asked to indicate how severe they perceived a variety of different sanctions to be, inmates indicated that three years of regular probation was as severe as being incarcerated in jail for six months or being placed on intensive supervision for one year

(Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a). A sample of recently convicted offenders' results were similar, with 75% of the sample indicating that either a serious probation term or a large fine (e.g., \$5,000) was more severe than a light incarceration sentence (e.g., three months) (Spelman, 1995). A study of probationers found that most felt their sentence of probation was a deterrent (Applegate et al., 2009). Research appears to suggest that a longer sentence of probation can be viewed as being more punitive than a shorter prison term, and that some offenders prefer a prison sentence over a longer probation sentence (Crouch, 1993; Petersilia, 1990; Wood & May, 2003).

Though the length of the probation sentence can influence one's perception of sanction punitiveness and probation is sometimes viewed as being more punitive than incarceration, regular probation is still often viewed by offenders as being on the less punitive side of the severity continuum. However, the opposite (i.e., more punitive) side of the severity continuum is often not as agreed upon (May & Wood, 2010). Alternative sanctions to prison (e.g., intensive supervision probation, boot camp) sometimes have been viewed as more difficult and punitive than incarceration (May & Wood, 2010; Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a). This, coupled with the length of probation sentence's ability to increase probation's perceived severity, suggests that there is a continuum of criminal sanctions that is not bound by probation and incarceration on both sides of the extreme. There appear to be many factors that influence if a criminal sanction is thought of as severe by a person (May & Wood, 2010).

When determining the severity of a criminal sanction, it appears that an offender takes into account the perceived inconvenience, intrusiveness and punitiveness of that sanction (May, Wood, Mooney & Minor, 2005; May & Wood, 2010). Research that

focused on the severity of alternative sanctions in comparison to incarceration concluded that perceptions of inconvenience, intrusiveness and punitiveness appear to be strongly influenced by program staff and parole/probation officers' conduct and personalities, as well as program revocation rates (May & Wood, 2010). Approximately 47% of the inmates asked agreed with the statement, "parole and program officers are too hard on the program participants, they try to catch them and send them back to prison" as being a reason why they would avoid alternative sanctions (May & Wood, 2010:29). This confirmed the idea that staff and officers' conduct and personalities have a bearing on determining perceived severity. A greater number confirmed the belief that alternative sanctions have high revocation rates. Fifty-eight percent indicated that "if you fail to complete the alternative sanction, you end up back in prison" as being a very important reason to avoid alternative sanctions (May & Wood, 2010:29).

Prison may be seen as less inconvenient, intrusive and punitive to some since offenders often see prison terms as having no strings attached in terms of supervision once they are released (Williams, May & Wood, 2008). On the other hand, alternatives to incarceration are seen as being inconvenient and intrusive (Wood & May, 2003). It might be preferable to serve a short incarceration sentence and not be supervised once released rather than try to complete and adhere to restrictive conditions in the community for a longer period of time. Slightly fewer than a quarter of inmates sampled agreed with the statements that alternatives to incarceration programs are "too hard to complete" and that "program rules are too hard to follow" (May & Wood, 2010: 29). How an offender ranks the severity of a criminal sanction is in part dictated by his or her perceptions of the inconvenience, intrusiveness and punitiveness of the criminal

sanctions. However, one's view of sanction severity is also influenced by one's demographic characteristics.

Effect of Offender Characteristics

Adding to the complex relationship between offenders and their perception of the punitiveness or severity of criminal sanctions is research that showed perceived punitiveness or severity is influenced by offenders' demographic characteristics and past experiences related to the criminal justice system (May & Wood, 2010). In some studies, there were no significant differences in how offenders rank the severity of a sanction based on some demographics (e.g., race, prior prison experience, drug dependence) (Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a, 1994b). However, in most research there were significant differences. There appear to be differences in how particular groups of offenders rate the severity of a criminal sanction (May & Wood, 2010).

Race

In terms of racial groups, Blacks are more likely to indicate a preference for prison and report viewing prison as less punitive than Whites (Crouch, 1993; May et al., 2005). Race was also the most important predictor of preference for jail term over two years of intensive supervision probation. The majority of Blacks (87%) and Hispanics (68%) indicated this preference, while only 41% of White and Pacific Asian participants did (Spelman, 1995). In addition to viewing incarceration as less punitive in comparison to Whites, Blacks view alternative sanctions as being more punitive than Whites. While both Blacks and Whites report perceiving jail and boot camp to be punitive sanctions and probation as being the least severe, White participants were more likely to perceive jail to be more severe than boot camp. Black participants reported perceiving boot camp to be more severe than a jail sentence (May & Wood, 2010; Wood & May, 2003).

In comparison to White probationers, Black probationers were two to three times more likely to indicate a preference for prison when asked to choose among incarceration in prison, incarceration in jail, incarceration in boot camp, supervision under electric monitoring and placement in a halfway house. Given the choice among probation, day reporting, intensive supervision probation and day fines, Blacks were three to six times more likely to indicate a preference towards prison time than White participants (May & Wood, 2010). Black probationers also differed in the amount of time they would be willing to serve under each alternative sanction. Blacks were less willing to serve time under the alternative sanctions in comparison to Whites (May & Wood, 2010). Overall, Whites were willing to serve twice as long of an alternative sanction in order to avoid incarceration than were Blacks (Wood & May, 2003).

The differences in race may be because Blacks view prison as being less punitive. When it comes to alternative sanctions, Blacks may view them as having too many rules that are too hard to comply with and to be more of a hassle than prison. Blacks may believe that under an alternative sanction they would be subjected to harassment and abuse by those who supervise the alternative sanctions, including probation officers. This may lead to Blacks viewing alternative sanctions as being more of a gamble and perceive a higher risk of revocation with these sanctions in comparison to Whites (May et al., 2005; May & Wood, 2010; Wood & May, 2003). Specifically examining the differences between the races regarding a preference to boot camps, Whites may consider boot camps to be a more physically safe environment than jail while Blacks may consider boot camps to be too controlling and pose a greater risk of revocation (May & Wood, 2010). Blacks and Whites' differing views has led to differences in the

willingness to participate in alternative sanctions, preferences for prison over alternative sanctions, and the amount of time willing to serve under alternative sanctions (May & Wood, 2010).

Gender

With respect to gender, women are more likely than men to be willing to participate in some form of alternative sanction in order to avoid incarceration (May et al., 2005; Wood & Grasmick, 1999; Wood et al., 2005). The only alternatives women were less amenable to are electronic monitoring and half-way houses (May & Wood, 2010).

When asked to indicate how many months of boot camp they would be willing to endure in order to avoid one year of prison, females reported a significantly longer amount of time than males did (Wood et al., 2005). When probationers and parolees were studied, women appeared to be significantly more amenable to community-based alternative sanctions than men were. Female participants were more willing to serve significantly longer sentences on community-based sanctions than in prison (May et al., 2005). In a study that examined inmates in Oklahoma correctional facilities, women were more open to serving longer sentence on alternative sanctions, with the exception of half-way houses, than men were (May & Wood, 2010; Wood & Grasmick, 1999).

Women might be more willing to serve longer sentences in a community-based program rather than incarceration because they may be single mothers and would be able to keep their children (May & Wood, 2010; Wood & Grasmick, 1999). Support for this assertion was found when being a parent had a positive impact on the amount of time women are willing to endure to in a boot camp in order avoid one year of prison (Wood et al., 2005). Women may be less willing to serve a sentence on electronic monitoring and in half-way houses because these alternative sanctions may be too

restrictive for women with children. Electronic monitoring may not offer the flexibility in schedule needed to attend to the needs of one's children, while "no visitors" policy common to half-way houses prevent women from living with their children or bringing the children to the house (May & Wood, 2010).

Another possible reason for women to be more willing to serve longer sentences on alternative sanctions is because many states have fewer female prisons than male prisons. Some states may only have one female prison. The chances that a female offender would be placed far from her home may be greater, and the distance may prevent regular contact with children and loved ones, leading the female to opt to a longer sentence on a criminal sanction that allows her to remain closer to home (May & Wood, 2010; Wood & Grasmick, 1999). Regardless of the reason, women report being more willing to serve some forms of alternative sanctions as a way to avoid imprisonment, which leads one to believe that men and women may weigh the severity of criminal sanctions differently.

Age

In terms of age, research has shown that older offenders are more likely prefer prison over alternative sanctions (Crouch, 1993; May et al., 2005; May & Wood, 2010; Spelman, 1995; Wood et al., 2005). In a sample of recently convicted offenders slightly more than half of the twenty-year-olds preferred to serve a three months jail sentence over serving a two year sentence on intensive supervision probation. In contrast, nearly two-thirds of the forty-year-olds preferred jail over intensive supervision probation (Spelman, 1995). In another study older inmates reported being less willing to enroll in boot camp and to serve as long of a sentence in boot camp than younger inmates (Wood et al., 2005).

Some have argued that older offenders may prefer incarceration over alternative sanctions because they perceive imprisonment as less of a gamble than alternative sanctions than younger offender do (May et al., 2005). Older inmates may also see those who volunteer to participate in alternative sanctions like boot camp as “punks” who are willing to be subjected to institutional embarrassment and who are fearful of serving time in the prison’s general population (Wood et al., 2005). Other offender characteristics believed to be associated with a preference for particular criminal sanctions include education and marital status. Offenders who reported a higher level of education tended to prefer a sentence of probation over prison, while prison was preferred among those who were unmarried (Crouch, 1993).

Offender type

The type of offender has also been linked to criminal sanctions preferences. In one study, 54% of those convicted of drug dealing or use preferred three months in jail over two year of intensive supervision probation, while 73% of violent and property offenders reported preferring a jail sentence (Spelman, 1995). It is possible that those convicted of drug offending may believe that they would not be able to keep dealing and/or using drugs while in jail but may be able to on intensive supervision. However, in a more current research drug offenders were more willing than nondrug offenders to choose an incarceration sentence over serving any duration of an alternative sanctions (May & Wood, 2010). The type of offender appears to influence one’s preferences of criminal sanctions, though the specific relationship of the influence remains unclear.

Criminal justice experience

Those with more exposure or experience within the criminal justice system, including prior prison experience, hold different preferences and beliefs about severity

(Crouch 1993; May et al., 2005; May & Wood, 2010; McClelland & Alpert, 1985).

Offenders who had prior exposure to correctional institutions preferred prison over any alternative sanction, and if willing to serve a sentence on an alternative sanction, they were willing to serve less time on each alternative sanction to avoid prison (May et al., 2005; May & Wood, 2010). Since prison is no longer unknown to those who have served a prison sentence, they may be less likely to be fearful of prison and see prison as easier than alternative sanctions. To those with prison experience, prison is seen as familiar while alternative sanctions are seen as harder than prison as well as more of a risk in terms of revocation (May & Wood, 2010; Williams et al., 2008).

In addition to prison experience influencing one's preferences for criminal sanctions, experience with the criminal justice system in general affects one's perceptions of punishment. When arrestees were asked to assign a number to a variety of criminal penalties while using the standard of a hundred being equivalent to one year in jail, those with more criminal justice experience were more likely to minimize the seriousness and severity of prison in comparison to the other penalties. Those with more previous criminal convictions were more likely to indicate incarceration as being less punitive in comparison to those with less criminal convictions (McClelland & Alpert, 1985).

However, the characteristics of sanctions will vary by jurisdiction. In other words, serving a probation or boot camp sentence in one place may be a very different experience than serving a probation or boot camp sentence in another (Schiff, 1997). Still, research suggests that different groups of offenders view sanction severity differently. Black offenders, male offenders, older offenders, unmarried offenders and

those with more criminal justice experience appear to be more likely to report a preference for incarceration over other alternative sanctions, while White offenders, female offenders, younger offenders, and more educated offenders tend to prefer alternative sanctions, including probation. The preference for a particular sanction may be a proxy for how one views the severity of a sanction, since one may be willing to serve the sanction that is seen as less punitive and more doable than a sanction seen as more severe.

Offenders Versus Non-Offenders

While there are differences in the rating of sanction severity among different groups of offenders, there are also differences between offenders and other groups of individuals. Offenders as a whole tend to rate sanction severity differently from other groups in the general population. A study that compared probation/parole offenders' perceptions of severity of sanctions to the perceptions of the probation/parole officers assigned to supervise them found that the officers felt prison was a more severe sanction than the offenders did. The officers also indicated that the offenders would be willing to do more time on alternative sanctions than the offenders were actually willing to do (Flory et al., 2006). Similarly, judges and probation/parole officers were more likely to rate alternative sanctions as being significantly less severe than offenders. Judges and officers were also more willing to personally serve longer amounts of the sanctions in order to avoid prison than offenders. Offenders reported being less willing to serve alternative sanctions in order to avoid being incarcerated in prison (May & Wood, 2010; Moore, May & Wood, 2008).

In terms of probation specifically, both a group of non-offenders (i.e., judges, probation and parole officers and members of the general public) and a group of

probationer and parolees reported finding probation to be the least severe sanction. However, the offenders did view probation to be more punitive than the other three groups did and would serve less of a probation sentence to avoid a one year incarceration sentence. The group of members from the general public indicated being willing to serve nearly twice the probation sentence in order to avoid prison than would the probationers and parolees (May & Wood, 2010). As previously mentioned, Minnesota DOC staff indicated that most probation conditions would be harder to comply with than a group of inmates believed the conditions to be (Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a).

Research has also focused solely on the views of non-offenders. Using a method known as magnitude estimation, Erickson and Gibbs (1979) asked police and citizens to assign a number to each penalty, using one year in jail as the comparison and represented by the number 100. Criminal sanctions perceived to be more severe than one year in jail were to be given a number greater than 100 and criminal sanctions perceived to be less severe than one year in jail were to be given a number less than 100. Police rated a sentence of one year in jail to be a 107.85, while citizens rate it as a seventy-five. One year in prison was assigned the value of 140 from the police but a 175.23 from citizens. A \$10,000 fine was rated as being equal to 135 by citizen, whereas such a fine was equal to a 400 for police.

Despite the groups disagreeing on about most criminal sanctions, they did seem generally to agree about the severity of probation. Police placed on one year on probation as a twenty-five on the perceived severity scale, while citizens placed probation as a thirty-five. In a study that examined the perceived severity of sanctions

among a grand jury pool, intermediate sanctions were perceived to be less severe than prison. Probation was consistently reported as a relatively easy sanction (Harlow, Darley & Robinson, 1995). In sum, research to date appears to indicate that offenders and non-offenders view criminal sanction severity differently.

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice may be an aspect of the criminal justice system experience that can affect probation success and perceptions of the supervision experience. The Procedural Justice argument was first developed based on the 1975 research of Thibaut and Walker (Casper, Tyler, & Fisher, 1988; Tyler, 1994). They examined the effects of case disposition processes on individuals' satisfaction and suggested that satisfaction was based on a combination of the case proceedings and the case outcome (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Since then research on Procedural Justice has continued to grow and expand beyond courts to other aspects of the criminal justice system (Casper et al., 1988). Procedural Justice researchers argue that, in order for individuals to obey laws, they must: (1) perceive their treatment as being fair; and (2) perceive the law and its agents to be legitimate (Tyler, 1990, 1994, 2003). Procedural Justice can be extended to probation and probationers and may offer an explanation as to why some probationers comply with the conditions of their probation while others do not.

If procedural justice occurs, people believing they have been fairly treated will be more likely to comply with rules or laws (Robinson & McNeill, 2008; Tyler, 1990, 2003). If offenders perceive the sanction they received to be fair, it upholds the legitimacy of law enforcement and increases the likelihood of them being legally compliant. Unfair sanctions reduce perceptions of legitimacy and, therefore, reduce compliance (Tyler, 1990). Fairness is not simply whether a sanction is received or not. Offenders'

interpretation of whether they had a fair hearing may be predicated on whether the criminal sanction decision-makers were respectful of them and their viewpoint (Sherman, 1993). Individuals who received unfavorable outcomes but who had the opportunity to express their views and who believed those views were considered by the decision-maker may come away more satisfied than individuals receiving more favorable outcomes but left feeling that their views were not expressed or considered (Casper et al., 1988). It is important that people believe that they were treated fairly, that decisions were evenhanded and impartial, and that they had the opportunity to be heard (Tonry, 2006). The perceived procedural fairness of the criminal justice experience shapes the perceived legitimacy of criminal justice agents (Tyler, Sherman, Strang, Barnes & Woods, 2007).

Legitimacy is an important factor in determining how people relate to officials (Tyler, 2003). When offenders view the law and its agents as being legitimate, they may be more willing to obey the law and be more compliant. If they see it as legitimate they will comply regardless of the risk or likelihood of detection (Tyler et al., 2007). Legitimacy is based on the criminal justice agent's respectfulness and the perceived fairness of the criminal justice process (Tyler, 1990). The agent's respectfulness has an effect on perceived legitimacy, which in turn has an effect on compliance (Sherman, 1993). Those who view the agent as being legitimate, as well as perceive their court process as being fair, will be more likely to comply. Those who are dissatisfied with the decision-maker's decisions may, because of perceived unfairness and/or because of viewing the decision-maker as not being legitimate, engage in criminal acts. The

breakdown of legitimacy may result in a loss of compliance (Sherman, 1993; Tyler et al., 2007).

A study that focused on Internal Revenue Service (IRS) audits showed that participants who heard stories about the IRS treating taxpayers unfairly were less likely to comply with the law than participants who did not hear such stories. Hearing the stories reduced the IRS' legitimacy and therefore shaped the participants' compliance with the law (Kinsey, 1992). Within the court system, research has shown that feelings of unfair court processing continued to shape views of legitimacy two years after the initial experience. Procedural Justice contributed to long-term compliance to the law by increasing positive attitudes toward the criminal justice system (Tyler, 2006; Tyler et al., 2007; Tyler & Huo, 2002). Those who felt they had been treated unfairly by the criminal justice system reported reduced legitimacy, as well as reduced compliance with the law (Tyler, 1990). Those who felt the law, the process, and the agents were legitimate tend to be more likely to obey the law (Tyler et al., 2007).

Examining probation specifically, the idea is that those who felt that their criminal court proceedings as well as the judge who sentenced them to probation were fair (i.e., they felt procedural justice) would be more likely to comply with their probation. They would be more likely to take the personal responsibility for obeying probationary conditions and, thus, be more likely to comply with those conditions than those who did not feel they experienced procedural fairness. Even in cases where the risk of detection for violating probation were low, individuals who perceived procedural justice presumably would still be more likely to comply (Tyler et al., 2007). Theoretically, procedural justice ideas can be extended to the conditions of probation. The conditions

that probationers perceive as being unfair would be more difficult for them to comply with than the conditions that they perceive as being fair. Individuals who receive technical violations would be more likely to violate on those conditions viewed as being unfair.

The behaviors and actions of probation officers may also impact compliance through legitimacy. Legitimacy would be related to how probationers relate to the probation officer and probation office (Tyler, 2003). Probation officers might exercise more influence over probationers' behavior if their authority is seen as legitimate. The officers whose probationers view as being fair and reasonable are more likely to be seen as legitimate; therefore, their probationers would be more likely to comply with their probation. Probation officers wanting to ensure compliance should strive to increase their legitimacy among their probationers (Robinson & McNeill, 2008).

In sum, the procedural justice perspective suggests that perceived legitimacy and procedural fairness are associated with compliance of the law (Casper et al., 1988; Sherman, 1993; Tyler et al., 2007). Despite the outcome, those who saw the law, sanction and/or agent as being legitimate and who felt that they were able to share their side, and that their side was heard, are more likely to comply. For the criminal sanction of probation, probationers who feel that they received probation fairly, that their conditions of probation are fair, and who view their probation officers as being legitimate are more likely to comply. In order to prevent violations of probation, probation officers need to secure their status of legitimacy among their probationers by being fair and respectful (Robinson & McNeill, 2008). The sentence of probation and all the conditions

of probation need to be perceived as being fairly received in order to ensure compliance.

Chapter Summary

The literature examining who is placed on probation was reviewed, with special attention placed on examining the demographics of Florida's probationers. Most probationers in Florida are White, male, serving a felony probation sentence and were sentenced to probation for a drug offense. It appears that most violations are due to technical violations and that there are some probationer characteristics (e.g., race, gender, age, education level, employment status) that are related to one's ability to successfully complete a probation sentence.

The research examining perceptions of the severity of criminal sanctions has demonstrated that the relationship between offender and criminal sanction severity is a complex one (Flory et al., 2006). Criminal sanction preferences and views of severity vary based on offender characteristics. One study that specifically examined perceptions of probation condition severity showed that inmates felt that the conditions asked about would not be difficult to comply with (Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994b). However, this study sampled individuals incarcerated and not individuals currently on probation. The importance of procedural justice, or experiences with the system as offenders progress through it, can be extended to probationers and may offers an explanation about how and why probationers will comply with the conditions of probation.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology this study utilized. First the location from which the sample was drawn will be discussed, followed by a section describing the target population and how participants were recruited. The third section will discuss the methods of data collection by describing the step-by-step procedure I took. This is followed by a description of the measurement instruments. Next there will be a section describing the dependent and independent variables. Sample characteristics will next be discussed. Last, there will be a section describing the analysis plan.

Context: Alachua County Probation

Misdemeanor probation was first adopted in the State of Florida in 1939 in Duval County (Senate Committee on Corrections, Probation, and Parole, 1990). In 1941, the Florida Parole and Probation Commission was created and became responsible for supervising the state's felony probationers (Florida Department of Corrections [FDOC], 2010). Today in Florida, misdemeanor probation continues to be managed through counties, as well as the Salvation Army and other small entities, while the Florida Department of Corrections supervises those sentenced to felony probation (FDOC, 2010; Senate Committee on Corrections, Probation, and Parole, 1990). In Alachua County those sentenced to misdemeanor probation come under the supervision of Alachua County's Department of Court Services Probation. Participants were recruited from Alachua County Probation, and therefore are all misdemeanant probationers.

Alachua County Probation's task is to supervise individuals sentenced to probation by a county court judge for having committed criminal traffic, misdemeanor or municipal ordinance violations. The program also supervises juveniles sentenced for criminal

traffic offenses and ordered to county probation. Individuals sentenced to county probation in other counties but reside in Alachua County are also supervised by this probation agency (Alachua County, 2010).

As previously stated, the organizational conditions of a probation agency dictates which model of probation an agency subscribes to and whether that model of probation is a rehabilitative model or a law enforcement model (Duffee & O'Leary, 1986; Glaser, 1969; Ohlin et al., 1956; O'Leary & Duffee, 1971; Lawrence, 1984; Tomaino, 1975; Whitehead & Braswell, 2000; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1992). In the case of Alachua County Probation the agency attempts to use a balanced approach, which combines the two models. From rehabilitation model, Alachua County Probation emphasizes assessing and providing treatment to probationers, while from the law enforcement model, the agency holds probationers accountable by violating offenders.

Though the agency attempts to create a balanced model of probation, there are variations among probationer officers. Probation officers typically adopt roles based on personal philosophies and/or the organizational policies of the probation agency (Clear & Latessa, 1993). From my observations of the probation officers and their case management, I noted differences in the flexibility with scheduling monthly meetings, expectations of when particular conditions should be completed, as well as differences in how quickly violation reports were written and for what probationers were being violated. This suggests that the probation officers who work for Alachua County Probation fall along a continuum with some being more service-oriented while others were more surveillance-oriented.

Those supervised by Alachua County Probation are assigned to one of the ten probation officers, all of whom work under one supervisor. Four of the ten officers manage a specialized caseload that focuses either of offenders sentenced to probation for domestic violence or offenders who were sentenced to jail time which they serve on the weekends (also known as weekenders). The remaining six officers carry a caseload composed of a variety of criminal traffic, misdemeanor and municipal ordinance violators and have an average caseload of 130 to 140 probationers (S. Longworth, personal communication, March 5, 2010).

Probation officers are assigned the task of monitoring whether the probationer is completing and adhering to the conditions established by the court (Stickels, 2007). The probationers are supervised by the probation officers for the designated period of time they were sentenced to supervision, which in Alachua County is typically no longer than one year. Some standard conditions of probation in this jurisdiction include: reporting monthly, notifying the probation officer of any changes in employment/education, and paying fines and court costs. Probation officers may also visit the probationers' homes and/or jobs. Additionally, probationers are required remain crime free. Depending on their situation, probationers may be required to attend counseling, support dependents, perform community service and attend a victim impact panel. Those sentenced to probation in Alachua County are typically required to pay a monthly cost of supervision fee, which often ranges from fifty to sixty dollars. Those able to demonstrate an inability to pay the fee are eligible to perform community service hours in lieu of the supervision fee and some of the court's fines and fees (Alachua County, 2010).

On any given day there are approximately 1,300 active probationers under the agency's supervision. However, that includes individuals whose supervision is being transferred to another jurisdiction and cases where a violation report is pending. At the beginning of this study, due to changes in the county's non-reporting probation program, Alachua County Probation also was responsible for monitoring individuals placed on "compliance probation." Also referred to as "unsupervised probation" or "level-one probation," this probation has fewer requirements than traditional "supervised probation." Typically those on "compliance probation" are only required to pay a onetime cost of supervision fee, pay court fines and not get arrested for a new crime. Some are required to report to the probation office once a month until all the conditions are met, while others only have to report to the probation office once. They sometimes are required to participate in community service or write a letter of apology (S. Longworth, personal communication, May 24, 2010).

Sample Procedure and Recruitment

Target Population

The target population for the study was individuals under current supervision by Alachua County Probation¹. In order to be eligible for the study, the person had to be over the age of eighteen, required to report to Alachua County Probation at least once a month, and not on "compliance probation" (i.e., had to be currently on "supervised probation"). The person was also required to reside in Alachua County and needed to

¹ An unknown amount of probationers interviewed were also currently on felony probation for a felony conviction. In the State of Florida, felony probation is supervised by the Florida Department of Corrections, meaning the person had to report to two separate probation agencies and had different probation conditions applied for each sentence. Though probationers were asked to limit their responses and comments to their misdemeanor probation sentence it is possible that some of the individuals' responses were influenced by their felony probation sentence.

have at least four months remaining on his or her sentence of probation in order to ensure adequate time to schedule an interview while still on probation.

A Court Services' program analyst used "Monitor," the case management software that maintains probationers' files, to compile a list of all the individuals on probation as of May 25, 2010. There were 1,651 on probation on that date. The analyst then removed those whose status indicated that they were expected to complete probation within the next four months and whose status indicated they were currently in jail, which removed 460 individuals (27.9%). The resulting list contained 1,191 individuals. From that list, a random sample was generated of those who the researchers² hoped to interview and for whom official data would be collected. The goal was to ensure that the sample results would be generalizable to the population of all remaining probationers.

The researchers first ensured that the list of participants was not listed in a systematic way (e.g., in alphabetical order or by probation officer). Next, we flipped a coin to determine each individual's eligibility to participate in the study. Tails indicated study participation. This process was repeated until a random sample of 450 participants was obtained. However, once the researchers began going through the probationers' file, it was discovered that not all probationers on the original list were eligible.

In some cases the probation officers had indicated in their notes a probationer's status instead of changing the status in the "Monitor" system, as should have occurred. In order to account for this, I went through the list and - by using probationer officers' notes on the "Monitor" system - removed anyone from the list who was currently in jail

² This study was done in conjunction with another graduate student who was working on her master's thesis. The self-reported data collection was done jointly.

and was in violation status that initial searching may have missed. Additionally, I removed anyone who was on mail-in status or was on “compliance probation.” Of the original sample of 450 probationers, 243 (54%) were deemed ineligible after review of the files. The remaining 207 probationers were eligible and, therefore, included in the sample.

In order to obtain the desired 450 participants, the researchers went through all the probationers’ file including those who were originally dropped from the study (i.e., received a head in the coin flip) and those for whom a coin was not flipped. From that list (N=741), 272 probationers were removed due to ineligibility. Using the list of 469 eligible participants, the researchers again flipped a coin until 207 individuals were identified. In combination with the group from the first coin flips, a total of 450 probationers were identified through random sampling. All 450 participants were assigned a subject code number (001 to 450).

Three months into the study, only 134 participants were interviewed due to the difficulty in getting the probationers to initially agree to participate and then to subsequently attend the interview. Additionally, some probationers ended up becoming ineligible as the study was ongoing (Appendix A). In accordance with my committee’s recommendation during dissertation proposal defense, a convenience sample was included during the last two months of the study. The convenience sample members were assigned subject code numbers ranging from 500 to 567.

Recruitment

Once the sample had been randomly selected, I attempted to recruit participants through: mail, probation officers, direct contact and telephone.

Recruitment through the mail

During the Month of June 2010, the researcher and the co-researcher mailed a recruitment letter to the initial random sample of 450 (Appendix B). The letter was mailed to the last registered physical address for the probationer, which was found in “Monitor,” the software that maintains probationers’ files. If no address was listed for a probationer, I obtained the probationer’s address from the court’s database, Legal Information Network Data Access System (LINDAS).

The letter informed the probationer about the study and indicated that participation was voluntary. Additionally, the letter informed the probationer that he or she had two options for scheduling an interview: (1) scheduling with the researcher via telephone or e-mail or (2) signing up in person on the day he or she was required to report to probation. Of the 450 letters mailed to the randomly sampled participants seventy-one letters were returned (15.7 %) (Table 3-1).

Table 3-1. Returned mail

Reason given:	Number
Not deliverable as addressed	39
Attempted not known	3
No such street	2
No such number	9
Vacant	1
Moved and left no address	2
Insufficient address	10
No mail receptacle	2
Unclaimed	3
Total:	71

Recruitment through the probation officers

Participants were also recruited through the same letters given to them by their probation officer during the month of June 2010 (Appendix B). I identified the probation officers for each of the 450 randomly selected participants. The probation officers were

then given letters addressed to the participants on their caseloads and asked to give the probationer the letter when he or she reported to see the officer. Of the 450 letters given to the probation officers to disseminate, eighteen (4%) were returned to the researcher after being identified as not qualified for the study (i.e., moved to mail-in status, early termination of probation, in violation status).

Recruitment through follow-up letter

During the month of September 2010, the researchers gave probationer officers follow-up letters to give to those who were originally contacted via letter but who had not yet had direct contact with researchers (Appendix C). Each of the letters was addressed to the potential participant specifically, and the person's name was written on the outside of the envelope so the probation officer knew to whom to give letters. Similar to the first letter used to inform potential participants, the follow-up letter informed the person about the purpose of the study and indicated that participation was voluntary. The follow-up letter also provided the probationer with the researchers' telephone number and e-mail addresses if he or she wanted to schedule an interview.

Due to concerns about the low response rate based on the study introduction letters, a convenience sample design also was implemented. In addition to the follow-up letters for specific probationers, I gave the officers extra copies of the follow-up letters that were not addressed to anyone specifically. The probationer officers were asked to give the letter to all the clients on their caseloads who had not been part of the original sample. Throughout September and October 2010, I continued to ask the probationer officers if they needed additional copies of the letter and dropped off more when they were needed.

Recruitment through direct contact

Since Alachua County Supervised Probation requires that probationers physically report to the office each month, the researchers also tried to recruit participants directly during the time they physically reported to probation. Probation officers typically schedule four probationers per hour and schedule their clients to report during the first ten days of the month (S. Longworth, personal communication, March 5, 2010). I obtained the days and times that the sampled probationers were scheduled to report through "Monitor". If no date or time was listed, I sent the probationer's officer an email requesting the information.

During the months of July and August 2010, either I or the fellow graduate student on the project was at the Court Services building from Mondays through Fridays from 8:30am until approximately 5:00pm during the first ten days of each month. One of the researchers would stand between the two waiting rooms, near where the individuals sign in to see their probation officer. The location allowed the researcher to hear the person say his or her name and determine whether the person signing in was one of the randomly selected probationers. If the person was determined to be one who was sampled, I either tried to talk to the probationer while he or she waited to be called by his or her probation officer or after the person had been seen by his or her probation officer.

I approached the person and identified myself as being a University of Florida researcher conducting a study that was independent from Court Services. I mentioned that he or she might have received notice of the study via mail or through his or her probation officer. The probationer was told that the interviews typically lasted an hour and that participation earned him or her either five hours of community service or one

month cost of supervision credit. If the person indicated that he or she would be willing to participate, I asked the person what days of the week and/or times during the day work best for him or her. Based on what the person said, I read the days and times available. I then wrote down the probationer's name and a phone number where he or she could be contacted in the date-time slot selected. Once the date and time was selected, I asked if the downtown public library was a convenient location for the person to be interviewed. If the downtown library was not, another public location that was closer to the person's home or work was selected. The probationer was then given a reminder card that had the date, time and location of the interview written on it, as well as a number the person could call if he or she needed to reschedule. The person was told that I would contact him or her the day before the scheduled interview as a reminder and to confirm that the date, time and location still worked for the person. Finally, I thanked the person for agreeing to participate.

If the person indicated interest but stated that he or she was not able to sign up for an interview at the moment, I gave the person a card that had the research phone's number on it. I then listed the person as "will call." If the person indicated preferring to contact me via email, I wrote my University of Florida email address on the card with the phone number. The person then was listed as "will email".

On the occasions where the probationer would indicate that he or she had completed his or her community service hours as well as paid the required supervision costs, I asked the person if he or she would still be willing to participate. In most cases the person would say no, and I listed the person as "not interested- done with both incentives". In two cases, the person said "yes" and an interview was scheduled. For

those individuals who were approached and then the person indicated that he or she was just not willing to participate, I listed the person as “not interested- refused.” Some probationers ignored my request to talk to them or walked away in the middle of the conversation. In those cases the person would also be listed as “not interested- refused”. No further contact was made for those listed as “not interested- done with both incentives” or as “not interested-refused.”

During the months of September and October 2010 either I or my fellow graduate student was at the Court Services building trying to recruit directly. However, as the result of the university’s fall semester beginning, there were changes in both our schedules and we were not able to be in the building all day (i.e., 8:30am through 5:00pm) trying to recruit during the first ten days in the month. Consequently, I obtained the dates and times of all the randomly sampled participants who had not been directly contacted during the previous months. We then attempted to be in the building for as many of those people as possible and then used the same initial face-to-face contact procedure as before.

The attempt to gather more interviewees through convenience sampling also occurred during September and October, while I was at the probation office. In addition to directly approaching those previously sampled, I made periodic announcements in both waiting rooms. I informed the individuals in the waiting room that I am a researcher from the University of Florida conducting a research project. I then said that anyone who is currently on reporting probation qualified for the study and that the study involved a one-time interview that lasts approximately an hour. The individuals were also told that their participation qualified them from either five hours of community services or

one month cost of supervision credit. I then asked if anyone was interested in participating. For any person who indicated his or her interest in participating, the same process for determining a day and time for the interview was used. The only difference in the direct recruitment procedure was that a star placed next to the person's name as an indicator that he or she was conveniently sampled and needed to be assigned a subject number. If the probationer indicated being interested in the study but not able or willing to sign up for an interview at the time, I gave the person the follow-up letter used to recruit originally sampled probationers, which explained the study and listed ways to contact me if he or she wanted to set up an interview.

Recruitment through follow-up phone calls

The final method used to recruit participants was through the telephone. In October 2010, participants who had failed to show up to their scheduled interviews and had not rescheduled were called via telephone. I went through the list of the individuals who had not shown up for their schedule interview ("no-shows") during the course of the study and confirmed that they still qualified for the study. Individuals who had been violated or had successfully terminated their probation were removed from the list. A total of twenty-one individuals were no longer eligible due to early termination of probation (N=6), end of probation sentence (N=1), moved to mail-in probation (N=3), no longer interested in participating (N=1), completed both incentives for participating and no longer interested in participating (N=2), and violation of probation (N=8).

I then went through the sign-up sheets and found the phone numbers for the remaining still eligible "no-shows" (Appendix A for classification system). In most cases the people failed to answer the phone, and I left a message when possible identifying myself as a University of Florida researcher who was trying to contact individuals who

had at one point indicated their interest in participating in the study. I also mentioned that the study would be coming to an end soon, so I wanted to ensure that anyone interested had the opportunity to participate. I reiterated on the message the benefits of the study and left the number for the person to call if he or she was interested in setting up an interview.

Of the fifty-three “no-show” individuals called, only twelve participants were talked to directly. Ten rescheduled an interview while one person indicated he had since completed probation (though the official record did not show that) and one indicated he had since violated probation (an official violation report was later written). For twenty-three of the “no-show” participants, the researcher left messages on the person’s voicemail or with someone else. Eighteen of the “no-show” participants were never reached because they never answered and there was no voicemail option, the number was incorrect or the number had been disconnected.

At the beginning of October 2010, I also contacted individuals who had indicated that he or she would call or email me once he or she determined a convenient interview time and who had scheduled an interview but who later cancelled. I used “Monitor” to try to obtain the phone number for those who had told me they were going to email or call but never did. Unfortunately, not all probation officers had a number or a current number for all the probationers on their caseload. In the case of those who cancelled, I used the phone number provided by the participant when he or she scheduled his or her original interview. Of the twenty-five individuals called, only seven rescheduled, one indicated he was no longer interested and two indicated that they had since completed probation. Nine of the probationers who had previously indicated an interest but never

scheduled an interview or who had scheduled an interview but canceled were never reached, either because they did not answer their phone, there was no voicemail option, the number was incorrect or the number was disconnected. For the remaining six probationers, the researcher left a message on voicemail or left a message with someone for the potential respondent.

I also contacted the individuals who were originally sampled but with whom I was unable to have direct contact while recruiting in the Court Services building. There were thirty-nine individuals whom the researchers were not able to ask directly whether they would like to participate in the study, either due to the person's failure to report to the probation office or the researchers missing the person when he or she did report to the probation office (Appendix A). In all the cases where the person was not directly contacted, I attempted to call the person using the telephone number listed on the person's probation file. The process for trying to contact the person was the same process used in the case of "no shows" or individuals where contact had been made in the past. The only difference was that I said I am trying to contact individuals who qualified for the study but had been unable to contact in-person rather than saying I was contacting those who at one point indicated interest in the study.

I was only able to talk to two people out of the thirty-nine in this category. One person scheduled an interview, and one person indicated she would call back once she figured out a convenient time. I was able to leave a message on voicemail or with someone for nine individuals. As in the case of the previous groups, some individuals were never able to be reached for various reasons (e.g., voicemail full, phone disconnected); twenty-one people fell into this category. Additionally, seven people

were never able to be contacted because the probation officer did not have a phone number listed for the person.

In summary, I attempted to recruit participants in several different ways. I attempted to recruit through multiple letters given to the person by his or her probation officer. Also by having a letter sent to the person's official mailing address. I attempted to recruit people in-person at the probation office, as well as through the telephone.

Data Collection

The study used both official data and self-report data in order to answer the study's research questions.

Official Data Collection

For each of the 450 participants identified through the random selection process as well as the sixty-seven participants conveniently sampled, I accessed the probationer's file and court records in order to obtain the following information: prior offense history, demographic information and terms of probation. I recorded what conditions of probation, including any special conditions, to which the person was sentenced. The probationer's criminal background history was obtained through the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and Florida Crime Information Center (FCIC). I created a criminal history form in order to record and collect data from the probationers' files (subsequent section for description of form and Appendix D). I only completed a form for those selected through the random selection process or who composed the convenience sample.

Self-Reported Data Collection: Face-to-Face Interviews

Prior to the interview

The day prior to a scheduled interview, I called the participant on the number given to me by the participant when he or she signed up for the study. I asked to speak to the participant directly. If the person was unavailable, I left a message either on voicemail or with the person who answered the phone requesting the participant call me back. Unless speaking to the participant directly, I only identified myself as a University of Florida researcher. If I was able to speak to the participant directly, I identified myself as the researcher conducting a Court Services-University of Florida study. I then asked the participant if the previously agreed upon time, date and location still work for the participant. If the participant indicated yes, I told the probationer the exact location where I would be waiting for him or her and the interview location. For example, if the interview was scheduled for the downtown location of the Alachua County library, I told the participant that I would be waiting by the television in the entrance lobby. Additionally, the participant was told to look for a person holding a clip board with a University of Florida sign on the back of it.

Most interviews were conducted at Alachua County library, and more specifically at the downtown location. The researchers had hoped to conduct interviews at the Court Services building, but due to limited space very few interviews were conducted there. The Alachua County's downtown library is approximately one block east of the Court Services building making the location easy for participants to locate and find parking. The library is also open seven days a week. For many interviews, I reserved one of the two private study rooms. When that was not a possibility, an area of the

library that offered some privacy was located (e.g., tables in the back of the children section, a bench in the movie section).

In cases where the participant indicated not being able to make it to the downtown library, a different location was agreed upon. In many cases these interviews occurred at other library locations or at my office at the University of Florida. However, in some cases fast food restaurants, Starbucks or public parks near the participant's home or work were selected. In all cases we conducted the interviews in public locations and never in a participant's home.

During the interview process

Once the probationer arrived at the interview location on the scheduled date, and an area that offered some privacy was secured, the participant was given an informed consent form (Appendix E). I read aloud the informed consent and the probationer was asked to follow along. The informed consent described the study and stated its purpose, as well as stated the rights of the participant. Any potential risks and benefits were also discussed in the informed consent form (Appendix F). After the form was read out loud to the probationer, (s)he was asked to sign and return it to me if (s)he agreed to participate. The signed informed consent was placed in an envelope and the participant received an extra copy of the informed consent. All study participants signed an informed consent form.

After the informed consent form was completed, I completed the cover page of the survey and removed it from the survey instrument. Removing the cover page removed all identifiers from the interview instrument except for the participant's subject code, which was assigned when the participant was randomly selected or when he or she volunteered for the study. Once the cover with all information that could directly link the

person to his or her responses was removed, the interview began. The interview instrument contained questions designed to obtain demographic information, perceptions of condition severity and one's belief about his or her ability to fulfill the conditions of probation³ subsequent section for a detailed description of the interview instrument and Appendix G).

The participant was asked both open- and close-ended questions. Open-ended questions allow participants to answer questions with open responses and are semi-structured and in-depth, whereas closed-ended questions require the participants to respond based on the choice options provided or information within a specific answer range (Groves et al., 2004). The questions were either open- or close-ended depending on the information sought. I recorded all of the participant's responses on the survey instrument.

For some of the close-ended questions, I gave the participant a colored card with the answer selections for that particular question on it and asked for participant's answer (Appendix H). The probationer was only given a card with answer options when it related to the specific question, and I retrieved the card when it was no longer relevant. If the person was unable or had difficulty reading, I explained the answer options following each question. I then read the questions to the individual and marked the survey form with the individual's responses.

In order to ensure complete records of the person's answers, I digitally-recorded most open-ended questions. When I got to a question that was open-ended, the digital-recorder was turned on, and once the participant completed his or her response, I

³ Probationers were asked additional questions that examined the fear of crime. These questions were the focus of the co-researcher's thesis.

turned off the digital-recorder. The first time the digital-recorder was turned on I identified myself and identified the participant by stating the participant's subject number. Throughout the interview, I reiterated to the individual to not use his/her name/nickname or describe details and events that could identify the person or others while the digital-recorder was on. Prior to turning on the digital-recorder for the first time, the participant was informed that if he or she does so during the interview, the information would be deleted from the recording's transcripts. Additionally, I informed the participant when the digital-recorder was being turned on or off so the participant was never recorded without his or her knowledge.

Of the 202 interviews, portions of 159 (78.7%) were recorded. The remaining interviews were not recorded due to various reasons. In nineteen cases the participant did not want to be recorded, while in six cases health related issues prevented the interview from being recorded (e.g., participant had difficulty talking due to throat cancer or the participant had lost his or her voice). One interview was not recorded because participant did not speak English, and the person conducting the interview felt it would be too hard to interview the person and translate the conversation while being recorded. Seventeen interviews were not recorded because the location did not offer enough privacy. In order for the digital-recorder to pick up our voices we would have had to speak louder which would have given people outside the study the opportunity to listen to the participant's responses. When the interview was not recorded and I came to a question that typically would be recorded, I took notes on the participant's response. Additionally, I also recorded direct quotes from the participant.

Most of the interviews were conducted by me or the fellow graduate student working on the project. However, nineteen interviews were done by other graduate students or undergraduate research assistants. In order to ensure that the procedure was the identical regardless of who was conducting the interview, everyone was required to observe one interview done by me or the co-researcher. The person was then required to conduct an interview under the supervision of either researcher before conducting interviews alone.

The interviews ranged from thirty-five minutes in length to two hours and fifteen minutes, with the average being forty-five minutes to one hour to complete.

Post interview process

Following the interviews, I downloaded the interviews from the digital-recorder to disks. The recordings from the interviews were then transcribed verbatim. The recordings from each interview were transcribed within forty-five days of the interview date by undergraduate research assistants. The recordings were then checked for accuracy by one of the researchers listening to the recording while reading the transcribed interviews. At this point we removed any names or personal identifiers. Once an interview was transcribed and verified, the digital-recording was deleted and the disk was erased.

In order for the participant to receive credit, the fellow researcher emailed the person's probation officer. Every two weeks, she emailed each probation officer a list of which probationers from his or her caseload had participated during the prior two weeks. The email only indicated that the participant met with us and did not indicate any of the participant's responses. Additionally, at the end of the data collection phase

of the study a list of all the probation officer's clients who participated in the study throughout the months was emailed to each particular probation officer.

Originally, Court Services indicated that participants were to receive five hours community service credit for their participation. Only if the participant was not required to perform community service hours or had completed his or her community service hours, was the participant to receive one month's cost of supervision credit. However, in many cases the probation officer used his or her discretion to give the participant the form of credit most needed by participant. Some probation officers allowed the participant to select which form of credit they wanted. In some cases the probation officer would give the probationer other forms of credit (e.g., work crew hours/days, waived drug test fees). On the rare occasion (i.e., two), the participant agreed to participate though he or she had already completed all his or her conditions of probation.

No show to the interview procedure

On several occasions a participant did not show up to his or her scheduled interview (N= 79, 15% of the total sample (N=517)). Ten minutes after the scheduled interview time, if the participant had not shown up I attempted to contact that person through the phone number given to me when the interview was scheduled. If the person answered, I asked the person if he or she was still planning on attending the interview. If so, I told the person exactly where I was waiting. If the person indicated he or she was not going to come to the interview, I tried to reschedule the interview for a different date and time. However, on most occasions the person did not answer his or her phone. In those cases, I left a message, whenever possible, stating exactly where I was waiting and that I would be there for at least twenty more minutes. I remained at

the scheduled interview location for at least twenty more minutes, which was thirty minutes after the scheduled interview time.

Measures

The research instruments were designed to measure the study's research questions. As previously mentioned the research questions are:

RQ 1: What are the conditions of probation that clients face in Alachua County?

RQ 2: What are probationers' perceptions of their conditions of probation?

RQ 2a: Specifically, do the conditions of probation fall on a continuum when it comes to severity? If so, which conditions are viewed as being most severe?

RQ 2b: Do probationers' views of the severity of a condition impact their perceived ability to complete a particular probation condition?

RQ 2c: What do probationers see as potential obstacles that would hinder them from completing or adhering to the conditions of their probation?

Official Data: Criminal History Form

The criminal history form was used to verify data obtained from the interview instrument, as well as to obtain information not collected during the interview. I accessed the probationer's file and court records to obtain official records pertaining to the probationer's prior offense history, demographic information and current conditions of probation (Appendix D). In order to answer Research Question 1, the official record of what conditions the probationer was sentenced to was used to verify the conditions the probationer reported being sentenced to adhere to or to complete. The remainder of the criminal history form was used to obtain or verify the probationer's demographics and characteristics, which served as independent variables in models used to estimate Research Questions 2a, 2b, and 2c.

To obtain the person's NCIC/FCIC records, I submitted a criminal history request form to the Court Services' records technician. Per the records technician's request, I requested no more than seventy-five criminal histories per week. Once all the criminal histories on my request were collected, I received notification to collect the completed histories. The first four questions on the criminal history form was be used to collect information for me to keep accurate records about the participant. The date that the probationer's NCIC/FCIC was run was recorded on the criminal history form as the date the criminal history was retrieved (Question 3). The date the criminal history form was completed (Question 4) was recorded once every question on the form was complete. Questions 5 through 7 were demographic questions (i.e., date of birth, gender and race) gathered from the probationer's probation file on "Monitor."

Previous criminal history questions (Questions 8 through 16) were answered using the person's criminal history obtained from NCIC/FCIC. I recorded verbatim each previous criminal offense as it was listed on the NCIC/FCIC printout. I also recorded whether each offense was a felony or misdemeanor and listed the degree of the offense. When the information was not available the space was left blank. The state where the offense occurred, the year of arrest and, when possible, the outcome for each offense were also recorded. Finally, the case number (consecutively numbered) was recorded (i.e., column b). This indicated how many cases a person had and allowed for the researcher to understand how many charges for each case. For example if a person's first recorded arrest had two criminal charges and both had the same case number, I listed both as case number 1. If the two criminal charges had two separate case numbers, I listed one as case number 1 and the other as case number 2.

In the first example, the person had one arrest for one case with two charges, while the second example had a person with one arrest for two cases with one charge each.

Some of the individuals' records had juvenile arrests listed. In these cases, I recorded the information and identified the arrest as a juvenile arrest so the information would be able to be sorted later by juvenile versus adult.

The next set of questions measured the current offenses for which the person was on probation (Questions 17 through 34 listed some common offenses that individuals are placed on to Alachua County Probation for based on an examination of the court's database, Legal Information Network Data Access System (LINDAS)). If the probationer was currently charged with a particular offense, I indicated so and recorded the case number. I used the probationer's file on "Monitor" to obtain their current case number. I then verified the information on LINDAS.

If the court records or NCIC/FCIC indicated that the person was originally arrested or charged with additional charges or counts or more severe charges (e.g., felony), I recorded the additional or original charge(s) or counts (Questions 17- 34). I then made a note identifying the charge or count as being dropped or reduced. An example of a charge being dropped would be if a participant was arrested for a driving while license suspended or revoked and driving under the influence but was only on probation for the driving under the influence. I circled both offenses and listed the case number for each but next to the driving while license suspended charge I would put in parenthesis "dropped". An example of a case with dropped counts would be if a person was arrested for three counts of possession of marijuana but was only on probation for one count. I would record the case number(s) and in parenthesis write "three counts but two

dropped”. If a person was arrested for felony battery but the charge was reduced to misdemeanor battery, I recorded the felony battery and its case number and in parenthesis wrote “reduced”. I also circled battery and listed the misdemeanor case.

Using LINDAS, I examined the probationer’s sentence and recorded in months how long the person was sentenced to probation (Question 35). If the person’s sentences ran consecutively, the total number of months was recorded. However, most individuals were sentenced to serve probation sentences concurrently and in those cases the longest sentence was recorded. Using the probationer’s file on “Monitor,” the expected termination date was also recorded (Question 36).

In order to obtain information regarding any violation of probation, I used both LINDAS and “Monitor”. I read the probation officer’s notes about the probationer and record any violations listed in the notes. I then examined the probationer’s court records and recorded any violations found. In most cases violations listed in the notes were also found in the court records. However, in some cases violations listed in the notes were not in the court records and some violations in the court records were not in the probation officer’s notes. In those cases the discrepancy was recorded.

The next set of questions recorded any violation of probation that involved new law violations (Questions 36- 42). The new offense was recorded verbatim, as were the date of the offense and the outcome of the violation. Any violations of probation that involved technical violations were also recorded (Questions 43- 79). The violations were selected based on commonly utilized conditions reported on the probation program’s website, an examination of individuals’ sentencing reports on LINDAS, as well as from conversation with Court Services’ employees. The number of times the

violations occurred and the outcome were recorded. In cases when the new law violation and the technical violation(s) had not been resolved, I recorded the outcome as “still open.”

The subsequent set of questions recorded whether a particular probation condition applied to the probationer (Questions 81- 118). The probation conditions were the same conditions selected under the technical violation section (Questions 43- 79). I used the person’s official sentence to obtain his or her conditions of probation. The first few conditions questions (81- 85) were standard conditions and applied to all probationers. For all other conditions, I only circled “yes,” if it was a condition that applied to the person. In the case of questions pertaining to financial conditions (Questions 90, 91, and 96), if they applied, I recorded the dollar amount owed. For the punitive conditions, (Questions 92, 93, 94 95 and 111), I recorded the hour, day, or month requirement of that particular condition where relevant. When a person was assigned a condition not listed, I recorded the condition in the additional spaces provided (Question 114- 118).

I obtain NCIC/FCIC histories for the entire sample (the initial random sample of 450 and the additional convenience sample of sixty-seven), and obtained access to all their court records. Though the probation files varied in completeness, all necessary information was located. Criminal histories forms were completed for the total sample (N=517).

Self-Reported Data: Interview Instrument

Generally, each section of the interview instrument was designed to answer a particular research question (Appendix G). Additionally, we completed a cover page and a section on personal characteristics thought to be relevant to in answering the

questions of interest. The first page of the interview instrument (the cover sheet) was used to help the researchers maintain accurate records of the interviews. It also allowed us to track whether the criminal history information was completed on the particular individual.

The personal characteristics questions (6- 13) asked the individual to report his or her parental status, marital status, race, employment status and education level. This section also asked the probationer to indicate general information about length of the probation sentence (Questions 14 and 15) and whether the person was sentenced to probation as the result of a plea agreement (Question 16). This section also asked the probationer to report the current charges for the probation sentence (Questions 17 through 35).

Next, we asked the person to self-report whether he or she received any violation during his or her current term of probation (Question 36). If the person indicated that he or she committed a new law violation, we recorded the offense, offense date and the outcome of the violation (Questions 37- 43). If the person indicated that he or she committed a technical violation, we recorded the number of times the technical violation(s) occurred and the outcome of the violation(s) (Questions 44- 81). The included conditions were the same as those on the criminal history form used when collecting official records data. The conditions were chosen for the interview instrument because they appeared to be conditions that are either standard to all probationers under Alachua County Probation, or because they are common conditions for a particular offense (e.g., victim impact panel for driving under the influence offenders).

They were chosen based on conversations with Court Services employees, a search of the Court Services' website and through a review of adjudicated cases.

The ensuing set of questions (82- 88) asked the probation indicate whether he or she had been sentenced to various types of sanctions and if so, how long. The sanctions asked about were: probation prior to his or her current sentence, intensive supervision probation, jail, prison, day reporting, electronic monitoring and boot camp. If the person indicated having a previous probation sentence, he or she was asked if he or she received a violation (Question 89). If the person indicated "yes," the next few questions (90- 96) collected any self-reported new law violations, including the date and outcome. Then, we asked about any technical violation(s), including the number of times the violation(s) occurred and the outcome(s) (Questions 97- 133).

In order to answer what probation conditions probationers in Alachua County were sentenced to (Research Question 1), probationers were asked to indicate the terms of his or her probation (Questions 134- 172). The interviewer read each of the listed conditions and indicated if the condition applied. If applicable, the person was asked to specify any amount, hours, days, or months. The first open-ended question (Question 173), asked participants to list any additional conditions that apply to them that had not already been discussed.

The next section of the interview instrument contained questions about the probationer's perception of condition severity and addressed Research Question 2. In the past researchers have tried to assess severity by using one of three methods of ranking: magnitude estimation, comparative judgments and offender-generated equivalencies (Wood & May, 2003). Magnitude estimation involves a standard level of

punishment being worth 100 points and participants being asked to assign a score of each criminal sanction in relationship the standard punishment. A sanction that is half as severe should be assigned fifty points (May & Wood, 2010; Wood & Grasmick, 1999). Though this method may be the most popular method used, it requires the respondents to have some mathematical ability and may not be appropriate for all populations (May & Wood, 2010; Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a). Because I was unsure of the participants' mathematical abilities, I decided that magnitude estimation was not appropriate for determining severity in this study.

The method of comparative judgment involves asking participants to identify which of the two paired options choices they perceive as being most severe (Spelman, 1995; Wood & May, 2003). Since over thirty conditions are being queried, I decided that having each participant indicate which condition is more severe in comparison to each other condition individually would be too cumbersome.

The offender-generated equivalency method requires participants to make comparisons of criminal sanctions based on their own experiences of incarceration and alternative sanctions. Typically in this method, participants are asked to indicate the number of months he or she would be willing to serve an alternative sanction in order to avoid a specified length of incarceration, also known as an "exchange rate" (May et al., 2005; Wood & Grasmick, 1999; Wood & May, 2003). However, it is possible that participants have no past experience with the conditions of probation, and that would make it difficult for them to indicate how long they would be willing to serve each condition.

Because I decided these approaches would not be feasible in the current study, I asked respondents to respond to severity using a Likert scale. Likert scales have been used in previous research to determine the perceived ranking of the difficulty of probation conditions in inmate populations (Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a). This study extends the method to determining the perceived severity of probation conditions among current probationers.

The next group of question (Questions 174- 211) was meant to determine how severe a probationer felt the conditions were and to determine if the conditions fell on severity continuum. The probationer was asked to indicate whether he or she felt each of the listed probation conditions were *not severe* (1), *somewhat severe* (2), *severe* (3) or *extremely severe* (4). Previous research has been criticized for not addressing what severity means to the participant and why he or she indicated the severity rankings (s)he did (Von Hirsch et al., 1992). In attempt to address this criticism, for each condition that the person indicated as being *extremely severe*, I asked, with the digital-recorder on, why the person felt the condition was *extremely severe*. For each condition that the person indicated as being *not severe*, I asked, also with the digital-recorder on, why the person felt the condition was *not severe*.

The following questions (212- 250) were based on Petersilia and Deschene's (1994a) work in which they had inmates estimate the difficulty of probation conditions. This work expanded the previous work by increasing the number of probation conditions being asked about from thirteen to thirty-two. The probationer was asked to indicate how difficult it is to comply with each of the listed conditions. Taken from Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994a) work the answer options were *not difficult (90% chance I could do*

it) (1), *relatively easy* (75% chance I could do it) (2), *about 50/50 chance I could do it* (3), *somewhat difficult* (25% chance I could do it) (4), and *very difficult* (10% chance I could do it) (5). To more fully understand why the probationer perceives the condition to be very difficult, the person then was asked to indicate why he or she felt so (Question 251). The participant was also asked to expand on why he or she felt a condition is not difficult to comply with or to complete. The open-ended responses were recorded. As was the case in Petersilia and Deschene's (1994a) work, each participant was asked to indicate how difficult does he or she felt the sentence of probation was overall using the above listed answer options.

The next section of the survey instrument was designed to determine what the probationer saw as potential obstacles for him or her completing or adhering to the conditions of his or her probation and to help determine if these obstacles influenced the perceived severity and difficulty of a particular probation condition. With the digital-recorder on, the participant asked what obstacles he or she may face that would prevent a successful completion of probation (Question 252). Then, a list of questions (253- 272) asked the participant to indicate his or her level of agreement with whether or not the item was a possible obstacle to successfully completing probation. The answer options were *strongly disagree* (1), *disagree* (2), *agree* (3) and *strongly agree* (4). Once again with the digital-recorder on, the person was asked to list anything that may help increase his or her chances of completing probation and whether he or she had any suggestions for removing any possible obstacles.

The final section⁴ of the survey instrument asked the probationer whether he or she had any policy recommendations regarding the types of criminal sanctions used in the American Criminal Justice System. The person was also asked whether there was anything that the person felt I should know about conditions of probation or sanction severity which had not been asked. Both questions were digitally-recorded.

Variables

Dependent Variables

There were multiple dependent variables utilized in this study, with multiple scales created for each of the three parts of Research Question 2. For Research Question 2a, which examined the severity of conditions, there were twelve scales created, while for Research Question 2b, which examined the difficulty of the conditions, there were eleven dependent variables including ten scales created. For Research Question 2c, which examined possible obstacles for adhering or completing to conditions, there were five dependent variables.

Research question 2a: Severity

In order to develop the severity scales, exploratory factor analysis was first conducted. Factor analysis allows for the discovering and summarizing of the pattern of intercorrelation among variables (Wuensh, 2004). Using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)TM, factor analysis was conducted with the items that were meant to assess the severity of probation conditions from the prospective of probationers. The probationers were asked to rate the severity of thirty-two different conditions of probation (Appendix G). The items' response options were based on a Likert scale with

⁴ Additional questions were included in the survey regarding the probationer's perception of the severity among different types of criminal sanctions. However, the questions are not included in this study, and instead will be used for a different study.

not severe (1), *somewhat severe* (2), *severe* (3) and *extremely severe* (4). I ran factor analysis using Varimax rotation, for the purpose of understanding the relationship among the items by approximating a simple structure. Varimax rotation is also the most commonly used rotation (Wuensch, 2004).

Scales based on factor analysis. Eight components had Eigenvalues above one. Scales were created based on what items loaded on the eight components at 0.5 or above⁵ (Table 3-2). The first component became the “routine condition scale,” and was composed of the five items: commit no new law violation, report to probation once a month, answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officers, notify probation officer of changes in residence and notify probation officer of changes in employment/education. The items loaded on the scale at 0.72, 0.79, 0.89, 0.86 and 0.80, respectively. The scale items were added together then divided by five in order for the scale values to remain the same as the original coding. Conceptually the items appeared to be related since they are all standard conditions of probation and part of a person’s routine while he or she is on probation. The Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91 indicated the scale had high internal consistency.

The second scale formed was termed the “offender specific scale” (Table 3-2). It was composed of six items: participate in mental health treatment, participate in employment program, complete batterer’s intervention program, complete anger management, no contact with victim and attend one victim impact panel. The items loaded on the scale at 0.56, 0.55, 0.86, 0.84, 0.65 and 0.66, respectively. The six scale items were added together then divided by six. This was done so the scale values

⁵ The factor analysis showed that the item, pay restitution and the item, complete Milepost class, did not load on any of the eight components at a level above 0.5 and were dropped from the analysis.

Table 3-2. Factor analysis for severity variables

Scales	Factor Loading	Scales	Factor Loading
Routine Condition Scale		Punitive-Activity Scale	
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	0.72	Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours	0.63
Item 2: Report to probation once a month	0.79	Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	0.63
Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	0.89	Item 3: Complete work crew days	0.73
Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence	0.86	Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	0.63
Item 5: Notify PO of changes in Employment	0.80		$\alpha = 0.80$
	$\alpha = 0.91$	Punitive-Restrictive Scale	
Offender Specific Scale		Item 1: Driver's license suspended/revoked	0.71
Item 1: Participate in mental health treatment	0.56	Item 2: Abide with order of impoundment	0.83
Item 2: Participate in employment program	0.55	Item 3: Abide by curfew	0.72
Item 3: Complete batterer's intervention	0.86		$\alpha = 0.73$
Item 4: Complete anger management	0.84	Standard-Financial Scale	
Item 5: No contact with victim	0.65	Item 1: Pay monthly cost of supervision	0.92
Item 6: Attend one victim impact panel	0.66	Item 2: Pay court costs	0.86
	$\alpha = 0.88$		$\alpha = 0.86$
Offense Specific Scale		Standard-Visit Scale	
Item 1: Submit to random screens	0.75	Item 1: Allow PO to visit residence	0.80
Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol	0.71	Item 2: Allow PO to visit employment site	0.88
Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	0.63		$\alpha = 0.89$
Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment	0.59	Standard-Employment Scale	
Item 5: Participate in drug treatment	0.54	Item 1: Try to obtain employment	0.87
Item 6: Attend driver's course	0.60	Item 2: Maintain employment/enrollment	0.79
	$\alpha = 0.85$		$\alpha = 0.81$

Cronbach's alpha= α

would remain the same as the original variables for comparison purposes. The scale appears to be composed of conditions that are applied based on the offender versus just the offense. For example, individuals charged with battery are not automatically placed into anger management. The particulars of the case and circumstances related to the individuals would determine placement into the program. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.88, which indicated good internal consistency.

The third severity scale formed was composed of six items (Table 3-2). The six items were: submit to random screens, do not possess or consume alcohol, do not possess or consume illegal drugs, participate in alcohol treatment, participate in drug treatment, attend a driver's course. The items loaded on the scale at 0.75, 0.71, 0.63, 0.58, 0.54 and 0.60, respectively. The items formed the "offense specific scale." The scale items were added together then divided by six for the scale values to remain the same as the original coding. The items conceptually fit, since the items appear to be ones commonly given to offender charged with driving under the influence or to offenders who had the reduced charge of reckless driving with alcohol. Both types of offenders compose a large portion of the sample. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.85, showing good internal consistency.

The fourth component became the "punitive-activity scale," and was composed of four items: complete community services in lieu of fees, complete mandatory community services hours, complete work crew days and complete a jail sentence (Table 3-2). The items loaded on the scale at 0.63, 0.63, 0.73 and 0.63, respectively. The scale items were added together then divided by four for the scale values to remain the same as the original variables. Conceptually the items appeared to be related since they were all

punitive conditions of probation. They also require the probationer to do some sort of activity. The Cronbach's alpha of 0.80 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

The fifth severity scale formed was the "punitive- restrictive scale" and was composed of three items: driver's license suspended/revoked, abide with order of impoundment and abide by curfew (Table 3-2). The items loaded on the scale at 0.71, 0.83 and 0.72, respectively. The three scale items were added together then divided by three, so the scale's values would remain the same as the original coding for comparison purposes. The items appeared to be related since they are all punitive conditions of probation. They also restrict the probationer's movement. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.73, which indicated fair internal consistency.

The remaining three scales were composed of two items each (Table 3-2). The sixth scale formed was composed of two items and formed the "standard- financial scale." The two items were pay monthly cost of supervision, which loaded at 0.92 and pay court costs, which loaded at 0.86. The scale items were added together then divided by two in order for the scale's values to remain the same as the original coding. The items conceptually fit, since both items are the only two standard conditions that require payment. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.86, showing good internal consistency.

The seventh component became the "standard- visits scale," and was composed of the following two items: allow probation officer to visit residence and allow probation officer to visit employment site. The two items, which loaded on the scale at 0.80 and 0.88, respectively, were added together then divided by two in order for the scale values

to remain the same as the original variables. The scale items were the two standard conditions that involve the probation officer visiting the probation either at home or at his or her employment site. The Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

The eighth severity scale formed was the "standard-employment scale." The two items, try to obtain employment and maintain employment/school enrollment, loaded at 0.87, and at 0.79, respectfully. The two scale items were added together then divided by two in order for the scale values to remain the same as the original coding for comparison purposes. The two items conceptually fit since they were both standard conditions that address employment. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.81, which indicated good internal consistency.

Scales based on literature. According to the literature, conditions of probation fall into one of three categories of conditions: standard, treatment, and punitive (Clarke, 1979; Petersilia, 1997a). All the conditions included in the study fell into one of these categories. Three severity dependent variables also were created by combining all the conditions that fall into a particular category (Table 3-3). The first scale that combined all the conditions within its classification was the "severity standard scale." It was composed of all the standardized conditions: commit no new law violation, report to probation once a month, answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officers, notify probation officer of changes in residence, notify probation officer of changes in employment/education, try to obtain employment, maintain employment/school enrollment, allow probation officer to visit residence, allow probation officer to visit employment site, pay monthly cost of supervision and pay court cost. The scale's

Table 3-3. Severity scales based on literature

Scales	Scales
<p>Severity Standard Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1: Commit no new law violation Item 2: Report to probation once a month Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence Item 5: Notify PO of changes in Employment Item 6: Try to obtain employment Item 7: Maintain employment/enrollment Item 8: Allow PO to visit residence Item 9: Allow PO to visit employment site Item 10: Pay monthly cost of supervision Item 11: Pay court costs <p style="text-align: right;">$\alpha = 0.87$</p>	<p>Severity Punitive Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees Item 3: Complete work crew days Item 4: Complete a jail sentence Item 5: Pay restitution Item 6: No contact with victim Item 7: Attend one victim impact panel Item 8: Driver's license suspended/revoked Item 9: Abide with order of impoundment Item 10: Abide by curfew <p style="text-align: right;">$\alpha = 0.84$</p>
<p>Severity Treatment Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1: Submit to random screens Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment Item 5: Participate in drug treatment Item 6: Participate in mental health Treatment Item 7: Participate in employment program Item 8: Complete Milepost class Item 9: Complete batterer's intervention Item 10: Complete anger management Item 11: Attend driver's course <p style="text-align: right;">$\alpha = 0.92$</p>	<p>Overall Severity Scale</p> <p>All thirty-two conditions</p> <p style="text-align: right;">$\alpha = 0.93$</p>

Cronbach's alpha= α

eleven items were added together then divided by eleven in order for the scale's values to remain the same as the original variables. The Cronbach's alpha of 0.87 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

The second scale formed based on the classification used in the literature was termed the "severity treatment scale" (Table 3-3). It was composed of eleven items: participate in alcohol treatment, participate in drug treatment, participate in mental health, participate in employment program, complete Milepost class, complete batterer's intervention, complete anger management, and attend a driver's course. The eleven scale items were added together then divided by eleven. This was done so the scale's values remained the same as the original variables for comparison purposes. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.92, which indicated high internal consistency.

The third classification-based scale was the "severity punitive scale," and was composed of ten items: complete community service hours in lieu of fees, complete mandatory community service hours, complete work crew days, complete a jail sentence, pay restitution, no contact with victim, attend one victim impact panel, driver's license suspended/revoked, abide by order of impoundment, and abide by curfew (Table 3-3). The scale items were added together then divided by ten in order for the scale values to remain the same as the original coding. The Cronbach's alpha of 0.84 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

Since there was no question that asked probationers to indicate their overall perception of severity of the conditions, the "overall severity scale" was created. The final dependent variable was created by combining all thirty-two conditions that probationers were asked to rate the severity of, and then was divided by thirty-two. This

was done so the scale's values would remain the same as the original variables. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.93, which indicated high internal consistency. The "overall severity scale" was one of twelve dependent variables used to answer the question regarding probationers' perceptions of severity of conditions.

Research question 2b: Difficulty

There were eleven dependent variables used to answer Research Question 2b, which pertained to how difficult probationers perceived conditions of probation to be to adhere to or to complete. As was the case with Research Question 2a, exploratory factor analysis was run. The probationers were asked to rate the difficulty severity of the same thirty-two different conditions of probation asked about in the severity questions (Appendix G). The items' response options were based on a Likert scale with *not difficult (90% chance I could do it) (1)*, *relatively easy (75% chance I could do it) (2)*, *about 50/50 chance I could do it (3)*, *somewhat difficult (25% chance I could do it) (4)* and *very difficult (10% chance I could do it) (5)*. Factor analysis was run using Varimax rotation, and seven components had Eigenvalues above one. Once again, scales were created based on what items loaded on the components at 0.5 or above⁸.

Scales based on factor analysis. The first component became the "mandatory attendance scale," and was composed of the nine items: participate in alcohol treatment, participate in drug treatment, participate in mental health treatment, participate in employment program, complete Milepost class, complete batterer's intervention program, complete anger management, attend a driver's class, and attend

⁸ The factor analysis showed that three items (i.e., report to probation once a month, no contact with victim and abide by curfew) did not load on any of the seven components at a level above 0.5 and were dropped from the analysis. One item, do not possess or consume alcohol, loaded above 0.5 on two components and was dropped from the analysis.

one victim impact panel (Table 3-4). The items loaded on the scale at 0.65, 0.84, 0.91, 0.87, 0.93, 0.83, 0.76, 0.66 and 0.71, respectively. The scale items were added together then divided by nine in order for the scale values to remain the same as the original variables. Conceptually the items appeared to be related since they all require the probationer to attend a group, class or individual session. The Cronbach's alpha of 0.94 indicated the scale had high internal consistency.

The second difficulty scale formed was termed the "monetary concerns scale" (Table 3-4). It was composed of five items: pay monthly cost of supervision, pay court cost, complete work crew days, complete jail sentence and pay restitution. The items loaded on the scale at 0.90, 0.82, 0.73, 0.51 and 0.56, respectively. The five scale items were added together then divided by five. This was done so the scale's values would remain the same for as the original variables. The scale appears to be composed of conditions that require probationers to pay and the two conditions that may affect one's ability to pay. Work crew days and a jail sentence may hinder one's ability to make money and make it difficult for individuals to complete the conditions that require payments. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.81, which indicated good internal consistency.

The third difficulty scale formed was composed of four items (Table 3-4). The four items were: answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer, submit to random screens, complete community service hours in lieu of fees and complete mandatory community service hours. The items loaded on the scale at 0.68, 0.70, 0.63 and 0.60, respectively. The items formed the "accountability scale". The scale items were added together then

Table 3-4. Factor analysis for difficulty variables

Scales	Factor Loading	Scales	Factor Loading
Mandatory Attendance Scale		Drug-Employment Scale	
Item 1: Participate in alcohol treatment	0.65	Item 1: Try to obtain employment	0.85
Item 2: Participate in drug treatment	0.84	Item 2: Maintain employment/enrollment	0.59
Item 3: Participate in mental health treatment	0.91	Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	0.61
Item 4: Participate in employment program	0.87	$\alpha = 0.60$	
Item 5: Complete Milepost class	0.93	Notification Scale	
Item 6: Complete batterer's intervention	0.83	Item 1: Notify PO of changes in residence	0.90
Item 7: Complete anger management	0.76	Item 2: Notify PO of changes in Employment	0.92
Item 8: Attend driver's course	0.66	$\alpha = 0.84$	
Item 9: Attend one victim impact panel	0.71	Restriction Scale	
$\alpha = 0.94$		Item 1: Commit no new law violation	0.58
Monetary Concerns Scale		Item 2: Driver's license suspended/revoked	0.69
Item 1: Pay monthly cost of supervision		Item 3: Abide with order of impoundment	0.70
Item 3: Complete work crew days	0.56	$\alpha = 0.42$	
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	0.51	Difficulty-Visits Scale	
Item 5: Pay restitution	0.73	Item 1: Allow PO to visit residence	0.87
$\alpha = 0.81$		Item 2: Allow PO to visit employment site	0.88
Accountability Scale		$\alpha = 0.79$	
Item 1: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	0.68		
Item 2: Submit to random screens	0.70		
Item 3: Complete mandatory CS hours	0.63		
Item 4: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	0.60		
$\alpha = 0.67$			

Cronbach's alpha= α

divided by four in order for the scale values to remain the same as the original coding. The items may go together since they hold the probationer accountable. The community service might hold the probationer accountable by having him or her do work in the community where others may see the probationer. Random screens hold the probationer accountable by ensuring that he or she is not drinking or using substances. Telling the truth to the probation officer holds the probationer accountable for his or her actions while on probation. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.67, showing weaker internal consistency than most of the other scales.

The fourth scale formed was the "drug-employment scale" (Table 3-4). It was composed of three items: try to obtain employment, maintain employment/school enrollment and do not possess or consume illegal drugs. The items loaded on the scale at 0.85, 0.59, and 0.61, respectively. The three scale items were added together then divided by three, so the scale values would remain the same as the original variables for ease of interpretation. The items may be related since two items involve obtaining and maintaining employment. For those who use drugs, obtaining and maintaining employment might be difficult. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.60, which indicated lower internal consistency than some of the other scales used in the study.

The fifth scale formed was composed of two items and formed the "difficulty-notification scale" (Table 3-4). The two items were to notify probation officer of changes in residence, which loaded at 0.90 and notify probation officer of changes in employment/education, which loaded at 0.92. The scale items were added together then divided by two in order for the scale's values to remain the same as the original coding. The items conceptually fit, since both items are standard conditions and involve

notifying his or her probation officer about changes in his or her life. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.84, showing good internal consistency.

The sixth scale formed was termed the "restriction scale" (Table 3-4). It was composed of three items: commit no new law violation, driver's license suspended/revoked and abide by order of impoundment. The item, commit no new law violation, loaded on the component at 0.58. The second item, driver's license suspended/revoked loaded at 0.69, while the third item, abide by order of impoundment loaded at 0.69. The scale items were added together then divided by three in order for the scale values to remain the same as the original coding. The items may have loaded on the same component because they involve restrictions on the probationer. Having one's driver's license suspended/revoked or one's car impounded would restrict the probationer's movement. Not being able to commit any no law violations might also restrict a probationer from doing things he or she might usually do if it were not for him or her being on probation. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.42, which indicated poor internal consistency. This was the lowest alpha across all scales.

The remaining difficulty scale was composed of two items and became the "difficulty- visits scale" (Table 3-4). It was composed two items: allow probation officer to visit residence and allow probation officer to visit employment site. The two items loaded on the scale at 0.87 and 0.88, respectively. The items were added then divided by two in order for the scale values to remain the same as the original coding. The scale items involve the probation officer visiting the probationer's home and employment site. The Cronbach's alpha of 0.76 indicated the scale had fair internal consistency.

Scales based on literature. As was the case with severity, dependent variables also were created by combining all the conditions that fall into the standard, treatment and punitive categories to allow comparison with the literature (Table 3-5). The first difficulty scale that combined conditions of a particular category was “difficulty standard scale.” All the standardized conditions (i.e., commit no new law violation, report to probation once a month, answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officers, notify probation officer of changes in residence, notify probation officer of changes in employment/education, try to obtain employment, maintain employment/school enrollment, allow probation officer to visit residence, allow probation officer to visit employment site, pay monthly cost of supervision and pay court cost) were combined and then divided by eleven in order for scale values to remain the same as the original coding. The Cronbach’s alpha of 0.74 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

The second difficulty scale was termed the “difficulty treatment scale” (Table 3-5). It was composed of the eleven treatment conditions that probationers were asked about in the interview instrument. Those items were: participate in alcohol treatment, participate in drug treatment, participate in mental health, participate in employment program, complete Milepost class, complete batterer’s intervention program, complete anger management, and attend a driver’s course. Once again, the eleven scale items were added together then divided by eleven for comparison purposes. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was 0.92, which indicated high internal consistency.

The third difficulty scale created using the literature-based classification was the “difficulty punitive scale” (Table 3-5). It was composed of the same ten items the

Table 3-5. Difficulty scales based on literature

Scales	Scales
<p>Difficulty Standard Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1: Commit no new law violation Item 2: Report to probation once a month Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence Item 5: Notify PO of changes in employment Item 6: Try to obtain employment Item 7: Maintain employment/enrollment Item 8: Allow PO to visit residence Item 9: Allow PO to visit employment site Item 10: Pay monthly cost of supervision Item 11: Pay court costs <p style="text-align: right;">$\alpha = 0.74$</p>	<p>Difficulty Punitive Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees Item 3: Complete work crew days Item 4: Complete a jail sentence Item 5: Pay restitution Item 6: No contact with victim Item 7: Attend one victim impact panel Item 8: Driver's license suspended/revoked Item 9: Abide with order of impoundment Item 10: Abide by curfew <p style="text-align: right;">$\alpha = 0.84$</p>
<p>Difficulty Treatment Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1: Submit to random screens Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment Item 5: Participate in drug treatment Item 6: Participate in mental health treatment Item 7: Participate in employment program Item 8: Complete Milepost class Item 9: Complete batterer's intervention Item 10: Complete anger management Item 11: Attend driver's course <p style="text-align: right;">$\alpha = 0.92$</p>	

Cronbach's alpha= α

“severity punitive scale” was composed of and those items were: complete community service hours in lieu of fees, complete mandatory community service hours, complete work crew days, complete a jail sentence, pay restitution, no contact with victim, attend one victim impact panel, driver’s license suspended/revoked, abide by order of impoundment, and abide by curfew. In order for scale values to remain consistent with the original coding, the scale items were added together then divided by ten. The Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

Unlike severity, the probationers were asked to indicate their overall perception of the difficulty of their sentence of probation (Question 251). The response options were the same as all difficulty questions. This was the final difficulty dependent variable used. This variable made the total number of dependent variables used to answer Research Question 2b, which examined probationers’ perceptions of the difficulty of probation conditions, be eleven. Of the eleven difficulty variables, ten were scales.

Research question 2c: Obstacles

Research Question 2c tries to determine what probationers see as potential obstacles that might hinder their ability to complete or adhere to their conditions of probation. The probationers were asked to indicate their level of agreement rate regarding twenty different potential obstacles (Appendix G). The items’ response options were based on a Likert scale with 1 *strongly disagree*, 2 *disagree*, 3 *agree* and 4 *strongly agree*. Using SPSS™, factor analysis was conducted in order to determine patterns among the variables. I utilized a Varimax rotation and found five components

had Eigenvalues above one. Five scales were formed with the items that loaded on the five components at 0.5 or above⁹.

Table 3-6. Factor analysis for obstacles variables

Scales	Factor Loading
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale	
Item 1: Finding time to report monthly	0.62
Item 2: Transportation to work	0.85
Item 3: Transportation to report monthly	0.88
Item 4: Transportation to do CS hours	0.79
	$\alpha = 0.85$
Responsibility Obstacle Scale	
Item 1: Finding a job	0.90
Item 2: Finding a good job	0.82
Item 3: Maintaining a residence	0.51
	$\alpha = 0.81$
Tracking Obstacles Scale	
Item 1: Paying court cost	0.86
Item 2: Paying monthly COS	0.86
Item 3: Number of probation conditions	0.54
	$\alpha = 0.79$
Punitive Obstacles Scale	
Item 1: Finding time to do CS hours	0.58
Item 2: Finding time to do work crew	0.91
Item 3: Paying restitution	0.72
	$\alpha = 0.73$
Living Environment Scale	
Item 1: Avoiding drinking alcohol	0.62
Item 2: Avoiding using drugs	0.69
Item 3: Lack of family support	0.56
Item 4: Neighborhood conditions	0.53
	$\alpha = 0.54$
Cronbach's alpha= α	

⁹ The factor analysis showed the item, participating in treatment, and the item, maintaining a job, did not load above 0.5. They were both removed from the analysis. Additionally, the item, transportation to do work crew, loaded above 0.5 on two components and therefore was removed from the analysis.

The first component was the “transportation-attendance obstacles scale” (Table 3-6). It was composed of the four items: finding time to report monthly, transportation to work, transportation to report monthly to probation office and transportation to community service location. The items loaded on the scale at 0.62, 0.85, 0.88 and 0.79, respectively. As was the case in all the previous scales, the scale items were added together then divided by number of items in order for the values of the scale to remain the same as the original coding. These items appear to be related conceptually since three items involve acquiring transportation to locations and the fourth item involves going to a location. The Cronbach’s alpha of 0.85 indicated the scale had high internal consistency.

The second scale involving potential obstacles for probationers was composed of three items. The three items were finding a job, finding a good paying job and maintaining a residence, which loaded on the scale at 0.90, 0.82 and 0.51, respectively. This scale was called the “responsibility obstacles scale.” The scale items were added together then divided by three in order for scale values to remain the same as the original variables. The three items seem to load on the same component since they are activities that involve some level of responsibility. Find a job, good or not, requires a person to take some responsibility, as does maintaining a residence (e.g., paying bills, cleaning house). The Cronbach alpha for the scale was 0.81, showing good internal consistency.

The third obstacle scale formed was the “tracking obstacles scale” (Table 3-6). It was composed of three items: paying court costs, paying monthly cost of supervision, number of probation conditions. The items loaded on the scale at 0.85, 0.86, and 0.54,

respectively. The three scale items were added together then divided by three, so the values would be comparable as the original variables. The items may be related because two items are conditions that involve making payments. These conditions require that the probationer keep track of what he or she has paid, as well as track of what he or she still is required to pay. The third condition requires the probationer to keep track of all his or her conditions of probation so he or she is able to complete or adhere to the conditions. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.79, which indicated good internal consistency.

The fourth scale formed was composed of three items and formed the "punitive obstacles scale" (Table 3-6). The three items were finding time to do community service hours, which loaded at 0.58, finding time to do work crew, which loaded at 0.91, and paying restitution, which loaded at 0.72. The scale items were added together then divided by three in order for the scale's values to be consistent with the original coding. The items conceptually fit since the three items involve completing or adhering to punitive conditions. Punitive conditions are imposed on a probationer as a way to reflect the seriousness of his or her offense by increasing the invasiveness and punitiveness of probation (Petersilia, 1997a). The three items might load together because their invasiveness and punitiveness might be seen as an obstacle. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.73, showing good internal consistency.

The final obstacle scale was the "living environment scale" (Table 3-6). It was composed of four items: avoiding drinking alcohol, avoiding using drugs, neighborhood conditions and lack of family support. The item, avoiding drinking alcohol, loaded on the component at 0.62, while the second item, avoiding using drugs, loaded at 0.69. The

third item, neighborhood conditions, loaded at 0.56. The final item, lack of family support, loaded at 0.53. The scale items were added together then divided by four in order for scale values to remain consistent with the original coding. The items may have loaded on fifth component because they might be obstacles involving the probationer's living environment. The probationer's neighborhood and family life might be obstacles, as well as avoiding drinking and using drugs if those substances are in the probationer's living environment. The Cronbach's scale for the scale was 0.54, which indicated fair internal consistency. The "living environment scale" made the total number of dependent variables examining potential obstacles to five. Overall, there were twenty-eight different dependent variables.

Independent Variables

Independent variables were selected based on previous research and consisted of information taken from both the official data and the self-report data. There were twenty-three independent variables included in the analysis. They were classified as variables that focused on personal characteristics, previous criminal history, and current offense and probation sentence.

Personal characteristics variables

Nine of the independent variables are variables that describe personal characteristics about the probationer. The first independent variable was *age* and was taken from official data collected from "Monitor." The variable was left as a continuous variable. The second independent variable was *race* and was also taken from official data. The files that indicated the individual was White were listed as a 1, the files that indicated the individual was Black/African American were listed as a 2 and those that indicated any race besides White or Black were listed as a 3. Asian was the only other

race listed in the records. The respondents were recoded to 0 indicating non-White and 1 indicating White. *Gender*, the third independent variable, was also collected from official records. Individuals identified as male were coded as a 1, while those identified as female were coded as a 0.

The next several independent were gathered from self-report information. The variable *ethnicity* was created by using Question 11, which asked participants “how would you describe your ethnicity,” then asked to indicated Hispanic or non-Hispanic. Those that indicated Hispanic were listed as 1 and those that indicated non-Hispanic were listed as 0. In order to determine the probationer’s current marital status the person was asked, “what is your current marital status” and given the answer options of married, widowed, divorced, separated, never married and living with a partner. The independent variable, *marital status*, was recoded so those who self-reported being married were coded as 1 and all other response options were coded as 0. *Parental status*, the sixth independent variable, was determined by asking the participant, “do you have children?” If yes, the person was coded as 1. If no, the person was coded as 0.

The seventh independent variable was *years of education* and was also taken from the self-report data. Participants were asked, “what is the highest level of education you have obtained”. The options were: 9th grade, 10th grade, 11th grade, high school, GED, some college, and other. The responses were coded so the option matched the years of education (i.e., 4th grade was coded as 4, 9nd grade was coded as 9). In the case of 12th grade and GED, both were recoded into 12, for 12 years of school. The responses that indicated education beyond high school or general

equivalence diploma (GED) were coded to correspond with the approximate years of education. For example associate's degree and bachelor's degree was coded into 14 and 16, respectively. This created the *years of education* variable, which was continuous.

The eighth independent variable created based on personal characteristics was *employment status*. Probationers were asked, "what is your current employment status," and given the response options of full-time, part-time, not employed and other. The response options were recoded so those who reported being employed full-time or part-time were listed as 1. All other options (e.g., retired, disabled) were listed as not employed and coded as a 0. The final independent variable was *sample*. Those who were conveniently sampled were coded a 1 and those who were randomly sampled were coded as a 0.

Previous criminal history variables

The next seven independent variables discussed were all variables collected from the official data. Unfortunately, it was not able to be determined if the juvenile records found in the NCIC/FCIC were complete and therefore the juvenile arrest information was deemed unreliable. Therefore, all the variables address the participant's previous adult criminal history. The first independent variable focusing on criminal history was a dichotomous variable and titled *previous criminal history*. Those who had a previous criminal history were coded as 1, while those with no previous criminal history were coded as 0.

In order to account for varying level of criminal histories in terms of seriousness, a *seriousness of criminal history* variable was created. During data collection, I recorded

all previous arrest offense levels (e.g., 1st degree felony, 2nd degree misdemeanor¹⁰). The arrests were then categorized into a crime type using the Alachua County's modified BJS' classification system as a public order, drug, property or violent offense. During data entry each arrest was placed into the crime type with the corresponding offense level (e.g., 1st degree drug felony =5, 2nd degree drug felony = 4, 3rd degree drug felony = 3, 1st degree drug misdemeanor = 2 and 2nd degree drug misdemeanor = 1). To create the seriousness of criminal history variable, all 1st degree felony offenses, regardless of crime type were combined into a dichotomous variable (i.e., 1st degree felony present= 1, no 1st degree felony present= 0). This also was done for the remaining two felony levels and two misdemeanor levels. Once the dichotomous variables were created the *seriousness of history variable* was created by combining the offense level variables. The presence of offense at each offense level corresponded with a number value: 1st degree felony =5, 2nd degree felony = 4, 3rd degree felony = 3, 1st degree misdemeanor = 2 and 2nd degree misdemeanor = 1. The higher the value the more serious the previous record, with fifteen being the highest level or seriousness and indicating the presence of all five offense levels in the person's record. A zero indicated none of the five offense levels were present.

¹⁰ Florida's classification system divides criminal offenses into two categories: felony and misdemeanor. A felony is any criminal offense punishable by more than one year of incarceration in a correctional institution; there are five levels of felony. Capital felony is limited to the charge of murder and is punishable by death or life imprisonment. Life felony is punishable up to forty years to life and a maximum fine of \$15,000 (MyFloridaDefenseLawyer.com, 2011). None of the interviewees' records indicated either level. First degree felonies are punishable up to thirty years and a fine of \$10,000. Second degree felonies are punishable up to fifteen years in prison and a \$10,000 fine. The final felony level, third degree felonies, is punishable up to five years in prison and a \$5,000 fine. Misdemeanors are criminal offense punishable by less than a year of incarceration in jail; there are two levels of misdemeanors. First degree misdemeanors are punishable up to one year in jail and a fine of \$1,000, while second degree misdemeanors are punishable up to sixty days in jail and a \$500 fine (MyFloridaDefenseLawyer.com, 2011).

The eleventh independent variable was *prior violent offense*. If the person's record indicated having a prior violent offense, regardless of the level of offense, the file was coded as a 1. Those with no evidence of a prior violent offense were coded as 0. The independent variable, *prior probation sentence*, was also a dichotomous variable. Any criminal histories that had a prior disposition of probation were coded 1 and those with no dispositions indicating a prior probation sentence were coded as 0. *Prior violation history* was also a dichotomous variable indicating whether the official records showed the person being arrested for a violation of probation. If the person had an arrest for a violation of probation on a previous probation sentence the file was coded as 1. If the person did not have an arrest for a violation of probation the file was coded as 0.

In order to account of jail experience the *jail history variable* was created. Any record that showed the person had received a case disposition of jail was coded as a 1. Any record that did not show the person had received a case disposition of jail was coded as 0. Due to a low frequency of individuals having a case disposition of a prison sentence, it was decided to not have a variable for prison history. However, a variable was created that indicated the level of a person's prior sentence history which included prison history. The *prior sentence history* variable was created by coding any record that indicated a prison sentence a 3. Those with a jail sentence were coded a 2 and those with a probation sentence coded a 1. The higher the number value the more serious the person's sentence history. A six indicated the highest level of seriousness and the presence of all three sentences in a person's history.

Current offense and probation sentence variables

The final independent variables focused on the probationer's current offense and probation sentence. The seventeenth variable, *current offense type* was an ordinal variable and taken from official records. The most serious offense for which the probationer was serving a probation sentence for was listed as the probationer's current offense. The offenses were classified into crime offense type using the modified BJS classification system. Public order offenses were coded as 1, drug offenses as 2, property as 3 and violent offenses were coded as 4. Another variable based on the current offense was *violent offense*. The variable was also taken from official records. If the individual was on probation for a violent offense, the person was coded as 1. For those on probation for non-violent offenses they were coded as 0.

The only variable based on the probationer's current offense and probation sentence taken from self-report data was the independent variable, *plea bargain*. The probationers were asked, "did you receive probation as the result of a plea bargain." Those that indicated yes were coded as 1 and those that indicated no were coded as 0.

Using official records I recorded whether the person's current charge was a reduced from a higher level charge. For example if the person had originally been arrested or charged with a felony and it was reduced to a misdemeanor. This information was used to create the variable *charge level reduction*. Those whose records showed a reduction in charge levels were coded as 1 and those whose records did not were coded as 0.

The final three independent variables address any violations that a person may have received on his or her current charge and were all collected from official records. If the probationer's probation file or court records indicated a violation, it received a

code of 1. If the file or record did not indicate a violation it was coded as 0. This created the dichotomous variable, *violation of probation*. The variable, *new law violation* was created by coding those with new law violations as 1 and those with no new law violations as 0. Similarly, those with technical violations were coded as 1 and those with no technical violations were coded as 0. This created the final independent variable, *technical violation*.

In total there were twenty-two independent variables used in the analysis. Some were collected from official records and some were collected from self-report information.

Sample Characteristics

Response Rate

Response rates were calculated using the American Association for Public Opinion Research's (AAPOR) Response Rate Calculator V3.1. The calculator distinguishes between response rates and cooperation rates. It also sets criteria for ineligibility, and specifies ways for calculating refusal and noncontact rates. The calculator allows for response and nonresponse rates to be standardized, which allows rates to be compared across surveys of varying research (AAPOR, 2011).

Since the AAPOR's Outcome Rate Calculator mainly addresses surveys conducted via telephone, mail, and the Internet, the researcher used the AAPOR's Standard Definitions in order to categorize the sample (Table 3-7). The 202 individuals interviewed were categorized in Category 1. Category 1 includes all those interviewed and all 202 individuals were listed under complete versus partial since all the individuals completed the interview.

Table 3-7. Outcome rate categories

Categories	Number
Category 1 Interview	
Complete	202
Category 2 Eligible: Non-interview	
Refusal and breakoff	97
Refusal	65
Miscellaneous	32
Category 3 Unknown eligibility, non-interview	
Other	25
Category 4 Not eligible	
No eligible respondent	96
Total	517

Under Category 2, Eligible: Non-interview, ninety-seven individuals were listed under refusal and breakoff. This classification is used for cases in which contact has been made and the person agreed to participate but the interview never occurs for various reasons (e.g., never answers the telephone at the designated time) (AAPOR, 2009). This is different than partial interviews because in the case of refusal-breakoff the interview never began. For this study any individual who agreed to participate but was never interviewed, either because they failed to show up, cancelled or never set up an interview, were listed as refusal and breakoff. Sixty-five individuals were listed as refusal. They were individuals who never agreed to participate and instead refused outright. Thirty-two individuals were listed as miscellaneous, since the person did not refuse to be interviewed and no interview was conducted. These were individuals with whom I was not able to have direct in-person contact.

Twenty-five individuals were placed under Category 3, Unknown eligibility: Non-interview; specifically under the classification of other. This classification is used for situations where the eligibility of the person is undetermined and which does not fit into one of the other classifications (AAPOR, 2009). For the purpose of this study,

individuals whose status was listed as administrative or mail-in were placed into this classification (Appendix A). Some of these individuals' statuses were unclear due to their case's specific circumstances (e.g., crisis stabilization unit admission, mail-in status during specific months).

The final category, Category 4 Not eligible, had ninety-six individuals listed under the classification of no eligible respondent. These are individuals who are no longer eligible to participate in the study because they do not meet the study's criteria (Appendix A). This included people whose probation sentence ended or individuals who never reported to probation during the course of the entire study. Additionally this included individuals who were waiting for a violation of probation case to be resolved and those who were removed from their current probation due to a violation of probation.

Based on the sample classification, the AAPOR's Outcome Rate Calculator calculated the response rate, cooperation rate, refusal rate and contact rate for the study (Table 3-8). In order to calculate the Response Rate 1 (RR1) the number of completed interviews is divided by the total number from Category 1 (i.e., interviews), Category 2 (i.e., eligible non-interviews) and Category 3 (i.e., unknown eligible non-interviews). The RR1 is also referred to as the minimum response rate. For this study the RR1 was 48%. The Response Rate 3 (RR3) is similar to RR1 but differs since it attempts to estimate what proportion of unknown eligibility individuals are actually eligible (AAPOR, 2009). The RR3 for this study was 48.5%, which is only 0.5% greater than the RR1. The Response Rate 2 and Response Rate 4 were not used since all

interviews were complete interviews and those response rate calculations focus on partial interviews.

Table 3-8. Rate estimates

Estimates	Percent
Response rate	
Response rate 1 (RR1)	48.0
Response rate 3 (RR3)	48.5
Cooperation rate	
Cooperation rate 1 (COOP1)	51.0
Cooperation rate 3 (COOP3)	55.5
Refusal rate	
Refusal rate 1 (REF1)	38.5
Refusal rate 2 (REF2)	38.9
Refusal rate 3 (REF3)	40.9
Contact rate	
Contact rate 1 (CON1)	94.1
Contact rate 2 (CON2)	95.2
Contact rate 3 (CON3)	100.0

The cooperation rate is “the proportion of all cases interviewed of all eligible units ever contacted” (AAPOR, 2009: 37). The Cooperation Rate 1 (COOP1), which is also referred to as the minimum cooperation rate, is the number of completed interviewed divided by the total number of from Category 1 plus the total number of non-interviews who were eligible individuals (e.g., refusal and break-off, refusal) (AAPOR, 2009). The COOP1 for the study was 51%. The Cooperation Rate 3 (COOP3) is similar but removes those who were unable to do the interview and identifies them as incapable of cooperating (AAPOR, 2009). The COOP3 was 55.5%, which is only slightly greater than COOP1. The Cooperation Rate 2 and 4 were not included because they focus on partial interviews.

Refusal rates are the percentage of cases where the individual refused to be interviewed or broke-off on interview. The Refusal Rate 1 (REF1) is calculated by

dividing the number of refusals by the total number of interviews, non-respondents and cases where eligibility is unknown (AAPOR, 2009). In this study the REF1 is 38.5%. The Refusal Rate 2 (REF2) includes the estimates of eligible individuals among situations when eligibility might be unknown (AAPOR, 2009). The REF2 was 38.9%, only slightly greater than REF1. The final refusal rate that was calculated, Refusal Rate 3 (REF3) is similar to the others but the unknowns are not included. The REF3 for the study was 40.9%.

Contact rates refer to the percentage of cases where the individuals were reached by the study researchers. The AAPOR's Outcome Rate Calculator calculates three contact rates. The Contact Rate 1 (CON1) is calculated assuming that all individuals whose eligibility was indeterminate were actually eligible (AAPOR, 2009). The CON1 was 94.1%. The Contact Rate 2 (CON2) includes only the estimated eligible cases among the indeterminate eligibility individuals, while Contact Rate 3 (CON3) includes only the known eligible individuals (AAPOR, 2009). The CON2 was 95.2% and CON3 was 100%. Overall, the response rates were slightly under 50%, while the cooperation rates were all slightly above 50%. All refusal rates were under 42%, while contact rates were all above 94%.

Interviewees

The study contained a total sample of 517 misdemeanor probationers. Table 3-10 illustrates demographic information for the entire sample (gleaned from random sample of official records plus the additional convenience sample official records) and illustrates differences between the people who were interviewed and those who were not. It allows an examination of the representativeness of the interviewed sampled. Descriptive information about the total sample was obtained through official data. Of

the 517 individuals comprising the total sample, 202 were interviewed. In order to have a complete understanding of those interviewed, the interviewees' sample characteristics included both official data and interview data (Table 3-9).

Personal characteristics

Among the 202 probationers interviewed, the mean age was 35.9 years old. However, the mode age was twenty-three and the age range of the interviewees was nineteen to sixty-nine years of age. The majority (N= 128, 63.4%) of the sample was male. Sixty percent (N= 121, 59.9%) of the interviewed sample was White, and nearly 40% was Black (N= 80, 39.6%). Less than 1% (N= 1, 0.5%) of the interviewed sample was Asian (Table 3-10). Ninety-three percent (N= 188, 93.1%) self-reported being non-Hispanic (Table 3-11).

Table 3-9. Origin of information

	Official Data	Interview Data
Personal Characteristics		
Age	X	
Gender	X	
Race	X	
Ethnicity		X
Marital status		X
Parental status		X
Education		X
Employment status		X
Length of stay in neighborhood		X
Juvenile Justice System History		
History present	X	
Age of first arrest	X	
Number of arrests	X	
Violation of probation present	X	
Adult Justice System History		
History present	X	
Jurisdictional information	X	
Arrest history		
Age of first arrest	X	
Number of arrests	X	
Seriousness history	X	

Table 3-9. Continued

	Official Data	Interview Data
Probation history		
Prior probation present	X	X
Number of probation	X	
Longest probation sentence (in months)	X	
Violation of probation		
Violation of probation present	X	X
Number of violations	X	
New law violation present	X	X
Number of new law violations	X	
Jail history		
Jail sentence present	X	X
Number of jail sentences	X	
Longest jail sentence (in days)	X	
Prison history		
Prison sentence present	X	X
Number of prison sentences	X	
Longest prison sentence (in months)	X	
Parole violation present	X	
Sanction seriousness history	X	
Alternative sanction(s) present	X	
Electronic monitoring		X
Intensive supervision probation		X
Day reporting		X
Boot camp		X
Pretrial release violation present	X	
Pretrial diversion present	X	
Current Probation		
Type of offense	X	X
Sentence result of a plea		X
Charges		
Number of current charges	X	
Reduction in number of charges	X	
Reduction in number of counts	X	
Reduction in offense level	X	
Sentence	X	X
Time served at time of interview		X
Violation of probation		
Violation of probation present	X	X
New law violation present	X	X
Number of new law violations	X	
Technical violation	X	X
Number of technical violations	X	

Table 3-10. Sample description based on official data

	Codes	Total N= 517		Interviewed N= 202		Not Interviewed N= 315		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Personal Characteristics									
Age									
Mean age		34.9		35.9		34.2		-1.56	
Mode age		24.0		23.0		24.0			
Median age		31.0		34.0		31.0			
Age range		19-69		19-69		19-68			
Gender									
Female	0	150	29.0	74	36.6	76	24.1		8.75**
Male	1	367	71.0	128	63.4	239	75.9		
Race									
White	1	275	53.2	121	59.9	154	48.9		6.38*
Black	2	237	45.8	80	39.6	157	49.8		
Asian	3	5	1.0	1	0.5	4	1.3		
Juvenile Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	72	14	18	8.9	54	17.1		6.29**
Age of first arrest									
Mean age of first arrest		15.0		13.8		15.4		2.30*	
Mode age of first arrest		16.0		14.0		17.0			
Median age of first arrest		15.0		14.0		16.0			
Age range of first arrest		1-17		7-17		10-17			
Number of arrests									
Mean number of arrests		3.6		4.2		3.4		-0.75	
Mode number of arrests		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of arrests		2.0		3.0		2.0			
Range of number of arrests		1-21		1-13		1-21			
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	17	24	6	33	11	20.4		1.64

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-10. Continued

	Codes	Total N= 517		Interviewed N= 202		Not Interviewed N= 315		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Adult Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	382	73.9	144	71.3	238	75.6		0.95
No Florida (FL) history	Yes= 1	13	3.4	7	4.8	6	2.5		
FL & 1 additional jurisdiction	1	47	12.3	13	9.0	34	14.3		
FL & 2 additional jurisdiction	2	13	3.4	6	4.2	7	2.9		
FL & 3 additional jurisdiction	3	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.4		
Arrest history									
Age of first arrest									
Mean age of first arrest		23.0		24.3		22.2		-2.79**	
Mode age of first arrest		19.0		19.0		19.0			
Median age of first arrest		21.0		21.0		20.0			
Age range of first arrest		15-53		17-53		15-53			
Number of arrests									
Mean number of arrests		8.1		7.5		8.5		1.04	
Mode number of arrests		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of arrests		5.0		4.0		5.0			
Range number of arrests		1-56		1-56		1-47			
Seriousness history									
Mean seriousness history		4.0		3.6		4.3		2.04	
Mode seriousness history		3.0		0.0		0.0			
Median seriousness history		0.0		2.0		3.0			
Range seriousness history		0-15		0-15		0-15			
Probation history									
Prior probation present	Yes= 1	248	64.9	88	61.1	160	67.2		1.22
Number of probation									
Mean number of sentences		2.6		2.6		2.5		-0.32	
Mode number of sentences		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of sentences		2.0		2.0		2.0			

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-10. Continued

	Codes	Total N= 517		Interviewed N= 202		Not Interviewed N= 315		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Range number of sentences		1-15		1-11		1-15			
Longest probation sentence (in months)									
Mean longest sentence		21.5		19.1		22.8		1.04	
Mode longest sentence		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Median longest sentence		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Range longest sentence		1-300		6-120		1-300			
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	192	50.3	64	44.4	128	53.8		2.77
Number of violations									
Mean number of violations		3.5		3.8		3.3		-0.91	
Mode number of violations		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of violations		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Range number of violations		1-18		1-18		1-16			
Number of new law violations									
Mean number of violations		2.4		2.5		2.3		-0.33	
Mode number of violations		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of violations		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Range number of violations		1-13		1-13		1-9			
Jail history									
Jail sentence present	Yes= 1	176	46.1	58	40.3	118	49.6		2.63
Number of jail sentences									
Mean number of sentences		3.6		3.6		3.6		0.12	
Mode number of sentences		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Median number of sentences		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Range number of sentences		1-16		1-15		1-16			
Longest jail sentence (in days)									
Mean longest sentence		139.2		127.4		145.0		0.89	

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-10. Continued

	Codes	Total N= 517		Interviewed N= 202		Not Interviewed N= 315		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Mode longest sentence		364.0		180.0		364.0			
Median longest sentence		90.0		90.0		90.0			
Range longest sentence		1-364		1-364		1-364			
Prison history									
Prison sentence present	Yes= 1	68	17.8	22	15.3	46	19.3		0.75
Number of prison sentences									
Mean longest sentence		3.1		2.7		3.3		0.74	
Mode longest sentence		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median longest sentence		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Range longest sentence		1-15		1-14		1-15			
Longest prison sentence (in months)									
Mean longest sentence		270.6		105.3		349.7		1.07	
Mode longest sentence		12.0		12.0 & 98.0		12.0			
Median longest sentence		40.0		33.0		48.0			
Range longest sentence		12-10,800		12-720		12-10,800			
Parole violation present	Yes= 1	4	5.9	2	1.4	2	4.3		0.07
Sanction seriousness history									
Mean sanction history		1.9		1.3		1.7		2.13*	
Mode sanction history		0.0		0.0		0.0			
Median sanction history		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Range sanction history		0-6		0-6		0-6			
Alternative sanction(s) present	Yes= 1	15	3.9	4	2.7	11	4.6		0.39
Pretrial release violation present	Yes= 1	8	2.1	5	3.5	3	1.2		1.18
Pretrial diversion present	Yes= 1	30	7.8	7	4.9	23	9.7		2.20

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-10. Continued

	Codes	Total N= 517		Interviewed N= 202		Not Interviewed N= 315		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Current Probation									
Type of offense									2.31
Public order	1	280	54.2	115	56.9	165	52.4		
Drug	2	49	9.5	15	7.4	34	10.8		
Property	3	78	15.1	28	13.9	50	15.9		
Violent	4	110	21.3	44	21.8	66	20.9		
Charges									
Number of current charges									
Mean number of charges		1.3		1.3		1.4		1.32	
Mode number of charges		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of charges		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Range number of charges		1-6		1-6		1-6			
Reduction									
Number of charges	Yes= 1	96	18.6	30	14.9	66	20.9		1.24
Number of counts	Yes= 1	26	5.0	11	5.4	15	4.8		0.28
Offense level	Yes= 1	88	17.0	36	17.8	52	16.5		1.37
Sentence (in months)									
Mean sentence length		11.0		11.1		11.0		-0.41	
Mode sentence length		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Median sentence length		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Sentence range		6-60		6-12		6-60			
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	143	27.7	42	20.8	101	32.1		7.26**
New law violation present	Yes= 1	81	58.3	24	57.1	57	56.4		0.00
Number of new law violations									
Mean number of violations		1.8		1.5		1.9		1.53	
Mode number of violations		1.0		1.0		1.0			

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-10. Continued

	Codes	Total N= 517		Interviewed N= 202		Not Interviewed N= 315		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Median number of violations		1.0		2.0		1.0			
Range number of violations		1-6		1-5		1-6			
Technical violation	Yes= 1	124	89.2	33	78.6	91	90.1		8.48**
Number of technical violations									
Mean number of violations		3.3		3.0		3.4		0.99	
Mode number of violations		4.0		1.0		4.0			
Median number of violations		3.0		3.0		3.5			
Range number of violations		1-6		1-6		1-6			

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-11. Sample description based on self-report data

	Codes	Total Interviewed N=202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Personal Characteristics									
Ethnicity									0.00
Non-Hispanic	0	188	93.1	143	93.5	45	91.8		
Hispanic	1	13	6.4	10	6.5	3	6.1		
Marital status									0.00
Married	1	27	13.4	20	13.1	7	14.3		
Not Married	0	172	85.1	131	86.3	41	83.7		
Divorced		40	19.8	30	19.6	10	20.4		
Separated		13	6.4	11	7.2	2	4.1		
Never married		103	51.0	77	50.3	26	53.1		
Living with partner		17	8.4	14	9.2	3	6.1		
Parental status									0.14
No children	0	80	39.6	59	38.6	21	42.9		
Children	1								
One child		41	20.3	30	19.6	11	22.4		
Two children		34	16.8	24	15.7	10	20.4		
Three children		21	10.4	16	10.5	5	10.2		
Four children		14	6.9	12	7.8	2	4.1		
Five children		3	1.5	3	2.0	0	0.0		
Six children		4	2.0	4	2.6	0	0.0		
Seven children		3	1.5	3	2.0	0	0.0		
Eight children		2	1.0	2	1.3	0	0.0		
Number of children									
Mean number of children		2.5		2.7		1.9		2.32**	
Mode number of children		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of children		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Currently living with child	Yes= 1	61	50.0	44	46.8	17	60.7		1.16

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-11. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N=202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Education									
4 th grade	4	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0		
6 th grade	6	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0		
7 th grade	7	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0		
8 th grade	8	2	1.0	2	1.3	0	0.0		
9 th grade	9	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0		
10 th grade	10	2	1.0	2	1.3	0	0.0		
11 th grade	11	16	7.9	10	6.5	6	12.2		
12 th grade/ GED	12	79	39.1	62	40.5	17	34.7		
Some college	13	63	31.2	43	28.1	20	40.8		
Associate's/ Vocational	14	15	7.4	14	9.1	1	2.0		
Bachelor's	16	13	6.9	10	6.5	3	6.1		
Master's	18	4	2.0	3	2.0	1	2.0		
Ph.D.	22	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0		
Mean (in years)		12.6		12.6		12.7		-0.33	
Mode (in years)		12.0		12.0		13.0			
Employment status		12.0		12.0		13.0			0.74
Employed	Yes= 1	118	58.4	87	56.9	31	63.3		
Full-time	1	81	40.1	61	39.9	20	40.8		
Part-time	2	37	18.3	26	17.0	11	22.4		
Not employed	No= 0	83	41.1	66	43.1	17	34.7		
Unemployed	3	59	29.2	45	29.4	14	28.6		
Disabled	4	12	5.9	12	7.8	0	0.0		
Retired	6	1	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0		
Student	5	11	5.4	8	5.2	3	6.1		

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-11. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N=202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Length of stay in neighborhood (in months)									
Mean		63.1		72.4		34.3		2.72**	
Mode		12.0		24.0		2.0			
Median		21.0		24.0		12.0			
Range		0.17-564		0.25- 564		0.17-480			
Prior Criminal Justice Experience									
Probation	Yes= 1	100	49.5	75	49.0	25	51.0		0.01
Violation of probation	Yes= 1	30	30.0	24	32.0	6	24.0		0.34
New law violation	Yes= 1	12	17.6	11	45.8	1	16.7		0.93
Electronic monitoring	Yes= 1	7	3.5	6	3.9	1	2.0		0.03
Intensive supervision probation	Yes= 1	12	5.9	10	6.5	2	4.1		0.08
Day reporting	Yes= 1	15	7.4	10	6.5	5	10.2		0.29
Boot camp	Yes= 1	2	1.0	1	0.7	1	2.0		0.01
Jail	Yes= 1	67	33.2	46	30.1	21	42.9		2.11
Prison	Yes= 1	21	10.4	19	12.4	2	4.1		1.95
Current Probation									
Type of offense									
Public order	1	110	54.5	84	55.3	26	53.1		0.00
Drug	2	17	8.4	13	8.6	4	8.2		0.00
Property	3	27	13.4	15	9.9	12	24.5		5.70*
Violent	4	47	23.3	40	26.3	7	14.3		2.30
Sentence result of a plea	Yes= 1	150	74.3	114	74.5	36	73.5		0.40
Probation sentence (in months)									
Mean		11.1		11.4		10.2		1.89	
Mode		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Median		12.0		12.0		12.0			

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-11. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N=202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Range		3-36		3-36		4-24			
Time served at time of interview (in months)									
Mean		5.1		5.3		4.5		0.14	
Mode		4.0		4.0		3.0			
Median		5.0		5.0		4.0			
Range		.00-18		1-18		.00-11			
Violation of probation	Yes= 1	8	4.0	7	4.6	1	2.0		0.63
New law violation	Yes= 1	4	50.0	3	42.9	1	100.0		0.31
Technical violation	Yes= 1	5	62.5	5	71.4	0	0.0		0.00

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

In terms of marital status, roughly 13% (N= 27, 13.4%) reported being married at the time of the interview. Of those not married (N= 175, 86.6%), the majority indicated never being married. Sixty percent (N= 122, 60.4%) of the interviewed group reported having children, and half of them reported currently living with their child (or children). Those with children tended to have multiple children (Table 3-11).

The interviewees' self-reported education ranged from a 4th grade education to a Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.). Roughly 12% (N=24, 11.9%) had less than a high school education, while approximately, 40% (N= 79, 39.1%) of the interviewees indicated completing the 12th grade or receiving a GED. Thirty-one percent (N= 63, 31.2%) had some college, 14% (N= 28, 14.3%) had college degree or equivalent. Only 3% (N= 5, 2.5%) held a higher degree. The majority of the interviewed sample had at least a high school diploma/GED, if not additional education.

The majority of interviewees were employed at the time of interview (N= 118, 58.4%), while only slightly more than 40% (N= 83, 41.1%) of those interviewed reporting not being currently employed (Table 3-11). Of those who were unemployed, a small percentage was unemployed due to a disability or retired. Five percent (N= 11, 5.4%) of the sample reported currently being only a student, but it is also possible that some of those who were employed were students. On average, the sample reported living in their current neighborhood for roughly five years and three months. Some had only resided in their current neighborhood for a little as five days, while others had lived in their neighborhood as long as forty-seven years.

Interviewed versus not interviewed comparison. As previously mentioned, official data were collected on all 450 randomly sampled individuals and sixty-seven

conveniently sampled individuals. The previously listed estimates were only those for the 202 interviewed. In order to determine if there were significant differences between those interviewed and those not interviewed, I compared the official interviewed estimates versus the official estimates of those not interviewed (Table 3-10). When comparing the personal characteristics of those who were interviewed to those who were not interviewed, there are significant differences between the groups on gender ($X^2= 8.75, p= .003$) and race ($X^2= 6.38, p= .041$). The interviewed sample had significantly more females and Whites than the not interviewed portion of the total sample. There was not a significant difference in age.

Juvenile justice system history

Of those who were interviewed, only 9% (N= 18, 8.9%) had an official record indicating that the person was arrested as a juvenile. However, it should be noted that NCIC/FCIC criminal histories may not have indicated an individual's entire official juvenile records. On average, most experienced their first juvenile arrests when they were fourteen. Additionally, those with juvenile histories often had multiple juvenile arrests. Of those with a documented juvenile history, one-third (N= 6, 33.0%) received at least one violation of juvenile probation (Table 3-10).

Interviewed versus not interviewed comparison. There was a significant difference between the interviewed and not interviewed sample with regard to the presence of juvenile justice system history ($X^2= 6.26, p= .012$), with the interviewees having significantly fewer individuals noted as having a juvenile history than those not interviewed (Table 3-10). Additionally, there was a significant difference between the mean age of first juvenile arrest between the two groups ($t= 2.30, p= .032$). The interviewed sample's mean age of first juvenile arrest was roughly a year younger than

the not interviewed sample's mean age. There were no significant differences in the mean number of arrests and the presence of violation of probation. However, due to concerns about the reliability of the juvenile history data, this information will not be used in the multivariate analyses.

Adult justice system history

In terms of prior criminal history, 71% (N= 144, 71.3%) of the interviewed sample had at least one arrest prior to the current charge (Table 3-10). Only small percentage (N= 7, 4.8%) of those with a criminal history only had out of jurisdiction arrests. Less than 10% (N= 13, 9.0%) of the interviewees had at least one out of jurisdiction arrest in addition to at least one prior arrest in Florida, while less than 5% (N= 6, 4.2%) had arrest history in Florida and two other jurisdictions. On average, the interviewees with criminal histories received their first adult arrest at age twenty-four. They also often had multiple arrests, with most having seven to eight prior arrests (Table 3-10).

In order to gauge the seriousness of an individual's criminal history, a variable was created where the presence of any arrest at a particular offense level corresponded with a number value. The higher the offense level the greater the value (i.e., 1st degree felony =5, 2nd degree felony = 4, 3rd degree felony = 3, 1st degree misdemeanor = 2 and 2nd degree misdemeanor = 1). These values were then combined; a fifteen indicated the presence of an arrest at each offense level, while a zero indicated no arrests (Independent Variables section for more details). Most individuals' records had the presence of a criminal history but often the arrests were for lower level offenses. The majority of those interviewed had a prior criminal history. Despite most having multiple arrests, the arrests were typically for low level offenses.

Probation and violation of probation history. Official records indicated that slightly more than 60% (N= 88, 61.1%) of the 144 interviewees with a criminal history received a prior sentence of probation at least once (Table 3-10). However, interview data showed that roughly 50% (N= 100, 49.5%) of the interviewed probationers self-reported having received a previous probation sentence (Table 3-11). Typically, most individuals with prior probation histories had three prior probation dispositions (Table 3-10). The longest prior probation sentence received by a person was recorded and equated to slightly longer than a year and a half (Table 3-10).

Forty-four percent (N= 64, 44.4%) of the 144 interviewees with a prior criminal history had at least one officially documented violation of probation (Table 3-10). On the other hand, interview data showed 30% (N= 30, 30.0%) having received at least one violation of probation on a previous probation sentence (Table 3-11). Of those with violations, most had multiple arrests for the violation of probation. Less than 20% (N= 12, 17.6%) of the violators indicated their violation was due to a new law violation but those with new law violation had two to three arrests for new law violations (Table 3-10). The majority of sample had served a previous probation sentence, and over a third of them had received a violation of probation.

Incarceration history. With regards to incarceration history, 40% (N= 58, 40.3%) of those interviewed had a jail sentence noted in the record (Table 3-10) while roughly 30% (N= 67, 33.2%) of the participants reported serving a jail sentence (Table 3-11). Those with prior jail dispositions typically had four (mean= 3.6). By recording the longest jail sentence received for each person with a jail disposition, it was determined that the mean number of days served on a person's longest jail sentence was 127.4

days, with a range of one to 364 days (Table 3-10 previous variables' mode, median and range). A small percentage (N=22, 15.3%) of the interviewees' records indicated that they had been sentenced to prison (Table 3-10). An even smaller percentage (N= 21, 10.4%) self-reported having served a prison sentence (Table 3-11). Of those with prison sentences, the majority had received one only prison sentence. The longest prison sentence served by a person was recorded and the mean longest prison sentence served by individuals was 105.3 months (Table 3-10). Of the twenty-two individuals whose official record indicated a prison sentences, only 1% (N= 2, 1.4%) was arrested for a parole violation.

In order to gauge the seriousness of an individual's history of sanctions, a variable was created so that a higher value meant more experience with criminal sanctions. The presence of prison history was coded as 3, presence of jail history was coded as 2, and presence of previous probation history was coded as 1¹¹. A value of six indicated a person had received a prison sentence, jail sentence and probation sentence, while a zero indicated the person had never received a prison sentence, jail sentence or probation sentence. Most individuals had a history of receiving criminal sanctions but most had not experienced all three sanctions (Table 3-10). In summary, majority had a prior probation sentence, a sizable portion had a jail sentence but only a small percentage a prison sentence.

Alternative sanction and pretrial history. According to official data, a very small percentage (N= 4, 2.7%) of the interviewees received an alternative sanction (i.e., house arrest, intensive supervision probation and extra duty as a military sanction)

¹¹ Due to inconsistencies in reporting the presence of an alternative sanction in the dispositions listed on NCIC/FCIC criminal histories, they were not included in the scale.

(Table 3-10). According to the interview data, less than 10% of the interviewees reported receiving the sanction of electronic monitoring, intensive supervision probation, day reporting or boot camp (Table 3-11). Five percent or less violated his or her pretrial release conditions and received the option of pretrial diversion at least once. Pretrial diversion typically implies that the person was placed into a non-criminal program prior to his or her conviction and upon successful completion the original charges are dropped (United States Department of Justice, 2011). The majority of the sample never received an alternative sanction, violated pretrial release or participated in pretrial diversion.

Interviewed versus not interviewed comparison. In comparing the adult criminal histories of those who were interviewed to those who were not, only two characteristics were significantly different. There was a significant difference between age of first arrest between the two samples ($t = -2.79, p = .006$). The interviewed sample's mean age of first arrest was older than the not interviewed sample's mean. There was also a significant difference between the two groups regarding history of criminal sanction seriousness ($t = 2.13, p = .034$). The interviewees' had a history of receiving less serious sanctions. There were no significant differences in seriousness of criminal histories, mean number of arrests, prior probation and history of violation of probation. Additionally, there were no significant difference between those who were interviewed versus those who were not interviewed regarding prior jail, prison, parole, alternative sanctions and pretrial information. The interviewees and those not interviewed had a very limited number of significant differences in adult criminal histories.

Current probation

In order to categorize the offenses for which individuals currently were on probation, I used the classification system used by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (James, 2004) and adapted by Alachua County Court Services for their use.

Interviewees' most serious current offense was classified as a public order offense, drug offense, property offense or violent offense. According to official data, most participants were on probation for a public order offense (N= 115, 56.9%) (Table 3-10). The next largest group were violent charges (N= 44, 21.8%), followed by property charges (N= 28, 13.9%) and drug charges (N= 15, 7.4%). Interview data showed similar percentages for all categories of offenses (Table 3-11).

Current charges and sentence. Almost three-fourth of the interviewees (N= 150, 74.3%) reported that they had received their current probation sentence as the result of a plea bargain (Table 3-11). On average, those on probation were only serving for one charge (Table 3-10). A small percentage of the interviewees (N= 30, 14.9%) had at least one of the original arrest charges dropped prior to adjudication, while a smaller percentage (N= 11, 5.4%) had at least one count dropped prior to adjudication (Table 3-10). Nearly 18% (N= 36, 17.8%) of the interview sample's current charge had been reduced to a lesser charge.

According to the official data, the average probation sentence for those interviewed was 11.1 months, with the range being six to twelve months (Table 3-10). Self-reported data showed the probation sentences ranged from three months to thirty-six months, with the average being 11.1 months (Table 3-11). At the time of the interview, the time served on probation ranged from 0.0 months (i.e., had not met with their probation officer yet but were sentenced to probation) to eighteen months, with the

mean probation sentence served at point of interview 5.1 months. In other words, most people had served roughly 50% of their sentence at the point of the interview (Tables 3-10 and 3-11).

Probation and violation of probation history. Of the 202 interviewed individuals, roughly 20% (N=42, 20.8%) had an indication of a violation of probation for their current probation case in their official records (Table 3-10). However, only fewer than 5% (N= 8, 4.0%) self-reported receiving a violation of probation (Table 3-11). Official records showed that nearly 60% (N= 24, 57.1%) of those who had violated, committed a new law violation, while 50% (N= 4, 50.0%) of those who reported violating self-reported the violation being for a new law violation. Nearly 80% (N= 33, 78.6%) of violators' official records had technical violations¹², while slightly more than 60% (N= 5, 62.5%) of the self-reported violators reported violating due to technical violations. Most violated for failing one condition versus violated for failing multiple conditions (Table 3-10). Approximately, one-fifth of the sample violated their current probation, with the majority of the violations being technical ones.

Interviewed versus not interviewed comparison. When comparing sample characteristics pertaining to the probationers' current probation, the only significant differences between the interviewed and the not interviewed were in violating one's current probation ($X^2= 7.26$, $p= .007$) and presence of technical violations ($X^2= 8.48$, $p= .004$). The not interviewed sample had more violations of probation and more technical violations present than the interviewed sample. The differences were expected considering 20% (N= 63) of the not interviewed sample became ineligible for the study

¹² Those whose violation was solely for a new law violation were removed; however those who had a new law violation and technical violations and those with just technical violation were included in the estimate.

due to their violations (Appendix A). There were no significant differences between those interviewed and those not interviewed in current offense type, change in charges, sentence length, and new law violations.

Overall, the probationers interviewed had few characteristics that significantly differed from those not interviewed. Out of the thirty-nine sample characteristics collected from official data, there were only eight significant differences: gender, race, presence of juvenile history, mean age of first juvenile arrest, mean age of first adult arrest, sanction history, presence of violation of probation and presence of technical violations. The interviewees were more likely to be female, White, not have a juvenile justice system history, younger at first juvenile arrest, older at first adult arrest, have received less serious sanctions in the past, not have violated current probation, and not have received a technical violation. Those interviewed were more likely to be male, non-White, have a juvenile justice system history, older at first juvenile arrest, younger at first adult arrest, have received more serious sanctions in the past, violated current probation, and received a technical violation. Few significant differences in characteristics suggest the interviewees generally are representative of those probationers who were unable to be contacted and/or interviewed.

Official Sample Description versus Self-Reporting Sample Description

As stated previously information about the sample was drawn from both official records and from self-report data. Eleven sample characteristics items were drawn from both sources (Table 3-12).

Similarities

Of the eleven items taken from official and interview data, four had estimates that were not significantly different. In many cases, the percentages appear to be similar but

statistically they differed (Table 3-12). The first item not significantly different was whether the person had served a prison sentence. Official records validated the number of prison sentences reported during interviews. The mean length of the probation sentence was identical in both the official records and self-report data. The official data and interview data did not differ significantly by type of offender. Both data sources had similar estimates of public order, drug, property and violent offenders. The final item that was not significantly different was the information regarding violating probation due to a new law violation.

Differences

Most of the information that was recorded both from official data and from self-report data were significantly different (Table 3-12).

Adult justice system history. Official data showed fewer individuals having a prior probation sentence than interview data did ($X^2= 13.48, p<.000$). A possible explanation for the difference is that not all cases dispositions were listed on the NCIC/FCIC criminal histories. In other words, in some of the cases where the disposition was unknown the person may have received probation. The percentages¹³ regarding the presence of a violation of probation for a previous probation sentence appear to be similar. However, there was a significant difference between the two ($X^2= 11.56, p=.001$), with individuals reporting having fewer violations of probation than found in the official records.

Of those with violations of probation, official records indicated a higher percentage of new law violators than people self-reported, and these differences were significantly

¹³ Previous estimates were based out of those who had a criminal history, while current estimates are based on the entire interviewed sample (N=202).

Table 3-12. Official sample description versus self-reported sample description

	Official Data		Self-Reported Data		X ²
	N	%	N	%	
Prior Criminal Justice Experience					
Prior probation present	88	43.6	100	49.5	13.48***
Violation of Probation	64	31.7	30	14.9	11.56**
New law violation	41	64.1	12	40.0	9.31**
Jail sentence present	58	28.7	67	33.2	12.15***
Prison sentence present	22	10.9	21	10.4	0.75
Current Probation					
Type of offense					
Public order	115	56.9	110	54.5	0.85
Drug	15	7.4	17	8.4	1.26
Property	28	13.9	27	13.4	0.25
Violent	44	21.8	47	23.3	0.01
Probation sentence (in months)					
Mean sentence length	11.1		11.1		
Mode sentence length	12.0		12.0		
Median sentence length	12.0		12.0		
Sentence range	6-12		3-36		
Violation of probation					
Violation of probation present	42	20.8	8	4.0	18.49***
New law violation(s) present	24	57.1	4	50.0	2.56
Technical violation(s) present	33	78.6	5	62.5	18.56***

Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

different ($X^2= 9.31, p=.002$) (Table 3-12). Individuals reported fewer new law violations than indicated in the official records. In the case of both violation of probation and new law violation estimates, it is possible the differences are due to the probationers not remembering accurately if an official report was submitted. They may have assumed the violation was a warning and not officially submitted to the court. Also, they may not remember the reason for the violation if it occurred a while ago or at the same time as other criminal cases. Official and self-reported jail estimates were similar, but the differences were significant ($X^2= 12.15, p<.000$). As was the case with probation, it is possible that the difference was due to official records not being complete.

Current probation. The sentence ranges differ, with official records indicating a range of six to twelve months. The self-report data indicated a range of three to thirty-six months. The difference may be due to some individuals indicating their earliest possible probation termination date and others indicating their sentence including additional time added after a violation of probation.

Official records indicated roughly 20% of interviewees had a violation of probation on their current probation sentence, while less than 5% of interviewees self-reported receiving a violation of probation (Table 3-12). There was a significant difference between the official and self-report ($X^2= 18.49, p<.000$). An explanation for the difference is that individuals did not realize that they had received a violation of probation and had only considered it to be a warning. A greater percentage of the official records indicated violations of probations for technical violations than self-reported a violation for technical violations. There was a significant difference between the official and self-report ($X^2= 18.86, p<.000$). A possible explanation for the difference

is they were unclear what the violation was for and had difficulty categorizing it as a technical violation.

Overall, the descriptive information that was collected by official sources and self-report information were significantly different on their prior probation history, prior violation history, jail history, current violation of probation and technical violations. In some cases the percentages appeared similar but were statistically different. Possible explanations include limitations of the official data and accuracy in self-reporting. The sample characteristics that did not differ significantly based on the source of data were prison history, sentence length, offense type and new law violations.

Random Sample Description versus Convenience Sample Description

Originally, I selected a random sample of records to interview, but due to a low response rate had to incorporate a convenience sample design later in the study (Recruitment section for more details). Of the 202 probationers interviewed, 153 (75%) were from the original random sample (“random sample”) while forty-nine (24.3%) were from the convenience sample (“convenience sample”). In order to determine if there were significant differences between the random sample and the convenience sample, I compared the random sample’s characteristics estimates versus the convenience sample’s characteristics (Table 3-11 for a sample description based on Self-Report Data and Table 3-13 for a sample description based on official data).

Similarities

Out of the over sixty sample characteristics collected from official and self-report data, there were only six characteristics that were significantly different across the two samples (Tables 3-11 and 3-13).

Personal characteristics. There were no significant differences between those randomly sampled and those conveniently sampled in terms of gender, race, ethnicity or marital status. Both samples were majority male, White, non-Hispanic and not married. The groups did not significantly differ in parental status, with most of both group's participants having a child or children. There was also not a significant difference in terms of those who are parents living with their children. The two groups did not significantly differ in educational attainment. In both groups the majority had at least a high school diploma/GED if not higher. There was no significant difference in employment status, with the majority of the random sample and the convenience sample having a job.

Juvenile justice system history. There were no significant differences between the presence of a juvenile justice system history between the random sample and convenience sample (Table 3-11). Fewer than 10% of both groups had a juvenile history. The mean age of first arrest and the mean number of arrests were not significantly different, with both groups' mean age of first arrest being fourteen. Additionally there was not a significant difference in the presence of violation of probation in the official records.

Prior adult justice system. In general there were not statistical differences between the random sample and convenience sample in terms of prior adult justice system experiences (Tables 3-11 and 3-13). There was not a significant difference in the presence of a prior criminal history, with majority of both groups having a prior history. Additionally, there were no significant differences in the mean age of first arrest, mean number of prior arrests, and seriousness history. Those who were

Table 3-13. Random sample versus convenience sample description based on official data

	Codes	Total Interviewed N= 202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Personal Characteristics									
Age									
Mean age		35.9		37.0		32.7		-2.33*	
Mode age		23.0		23.0		22.0 & 41.0			
Median age		34.0		35.0		31.0			
Age range		19-69		20-69		19-64			
Gender									
Female	0	74	36.6	56	36.6	18	36.7		0.00
Male	1	128	63.4	97	63.4	31	63.3		
Race									
White	0	121	59.9	30	61.2	91	59.5		0.00
Black	1	80	39.6	19	38.8	61	39.9		
Asian	1	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.7		
Juvenile Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	18	8.9	14	9.2	4	8.2		0.00
Age of first arrest									
Mean age of first arrest		13.8		13.6		14.3		0.57	
Mode age of first arrest		14.0		14.0		14.0			
Median age of first arrest		14.0		14.0		14.0			
Age range of first arrest		7-17		7-17		13-16			
Number of arrests									
Mean number of arrests		4.2		3.3		7.5		1.70	
Mode number of arrests		1.0		1.0 & 3.0		1.0 & 12.0			
Median number of arrests		3.0		2.5		8.5			
Range of number of arrests		1-13		1-13		1-12			
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	6	33	3	21.4	3	75.0		1.97

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-13. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N= 202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Adult Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	144	71.3	109	71.2	35	71.4		0.00
No Florida (FL) history	Yes= 1	7	4.8	6	5.5	1	2.9		
FL & 1 additional jurisdiction	1	13	9.0	11	10.1	2	5.7		
FL & 2 additional jurisdiction	2	6	4.2	6	5.5	0	0.0		
FL & 3 additional jurisdiction	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
Arrest history									
Mean age of first arrest									
Mean age of first arrest		24.3		24.4		23.9		-0.28	
Mode age of first arrest		19.0		19.0		19.0 & JJ			
Median age of first arrest		21.0		21.0		21.0			
Age range of first arrest		17-53		18-53		17-47			
Number of arrests									
Mean number of arrests		7.5		8.0		5.7		-1.46	
Mode number of arrests		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of arrests		4.0		5.0		3.0			
Range number of arrests		1-56		1-56		1-39			
Seriousness history									
Mean seriousness history		3.6		3.6		3.6		0.00	
Mode seriousness history		0.0		0.0		0.0			
Median seriousness history		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Range seriousness history		0-15		0-15		0-15			
Probation history									
Prior probation present	Yes= 1	248	64.9	68	62.4	20	57.1		0.35
Number of probation									
Mean number of sentences		2.6		2.8		1.9		-1.93	
Mode number of sentences		1.0		1.0		1.0			

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-13. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N= 202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Median number of sentences		2.0		2.0		1.0			
Range number of sentences		1-11		1-11		1-8			
Longest probation sentence (in months)									
Mean longest sentence		19.1		21.1		12.3		-2.90*	
Mode longest sentence		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Median longest sentence		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Range longest sentence		6-120		6-120		6-36			
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	192	50.3	49	44.9	15	42.9		0.04
Number of violations									
Mean number of violations		3.8		3.7		4.1		0.30	
Mode number of violations		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of violations		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Range number of violations		1-18		1-18		1-17			
Number of new law violations									
Mean number of violations		2.5		2.2		3.7		0.13	
Mode number of violations		1.0		1.0		2.0			
Median number of violations		2.0		1.0		& 2.0			
Range number of violations		1-13		1-13		1-10			
Jail history									
Jail sentence present	Yes= 1	176	46.1	49	44.9	9	25.7		3.61
Number of jail sentences									
Mean number of sentences		3.6		3.7		3.1		-0.76	
Mode number of sentences		2.0		2.0		2.0			
Median number of sentences		2.0		2.0		2.5			

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-13. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N= 202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Range number of sentences		1-15		1-15		1-6			
Longest jail sentence (in days)									
Mean longest sentence		139.2		135.9		85.5		-1.30	
Mode longest sentence		180.0		180.0		58.5			
Median longest sentence		90.0		90.0		60.0			
Range longest sentence		1-364		1-364		9-364			
Prison history									
Prison sentence present	Yes= 1	68	17.8	19	17.4	3	8.6		1.15
Number of prison sentences									
Mean number of sentences		2.7		2.8		2.5		-0.26	
Mode number of sentences		1.0		1.0		1.0 & 4.0			
Median number of sentences		2.0		2.0		2.5			
Range number of sentences		1-14		1-14		1-4			
Longest prison sentence (in months)									
Mean longest sentence		127.4		101.0		126.0		0.28	
Mode longest sentence		12.0 & 98.0		98.0		66.0			
Median longest sentence		33.0		30.0		12.0 & 18.0			
Range longest sentence		12-720		12-720		12-360			
Parole violation present	Yes= 1	2	1.4	1	1.0	1	2.9		0.07
Sanction seriousness history									
Mean sanction history		1.3		1.5		1.0		-1.90	
Mode sanction history		0.0		0.0		0.0			
Median sanction history		1.0		1.0		0.0			
Range sanction history		0-6		0-6		0-6			
Alternative sanction(s) present	Yes= 1	4	2.7	3	2.8	1	2.9		0.00

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-13. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N= 202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Pretrial release violation present	Yes= 1	5	3.5	3	2.8	2	5.7		0.07
Pretrial diversion present	Yes= 1	7	4.9	6	5.5	1	2.9		0.05
Current Probation									
Type of offense									
Public order	1	115	56.9	28	57.1	87	56.9		0.00
Drug	2	15	7.4	4	8.2	11	7.2		0.00
Property	3	28	13.9	12	24.5	16	10.5		5.00*
Violent	4	44	21.8	5	10.2	39	25.5		4.23
Charges									
Number of current charges									
Mean number of charges		1.3		1.3		1.2		-0.80	
Mode number of charges		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of charges		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Range number of charges		1-6		1-6		1-3			
Reduction									
Number of charges	Yes= 1	30	14.9	21	19.3	9	25.7		0.10
Number of counts	Yes= 1	11	5.4	9	8.3	2	5.7		0.08
Offense level	Yes= 1	36	17.8	28	25.7	8	22.9		0.24
Sentence (in months)									
Mean sentence length		11.1		11.4		10.0		-3.34**	
Mode sentence length		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Median sentence length		12.0		12.0		12.0			
Sentence range		6-12		6-12		6-12			
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	42	20.8	29	18.9	13	26.5		0.87
New law violation present	Yes= 1	24	57.1	16	55.2	8	61.5		0.00

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3-13. Continued

	Codes	Total Interviewed N= 202		Random Sample N= 153		Convenience Sample N= 49		t	X ²
		N	%	N	%	N	%		
Number of new law violations									
Mean number of violations		1.5		1.7		1.3		-1.33	
Mode number of violations		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Median number of violations		2.0		1.0		1.0			
Range number of violations		1-5		1-5		1-2			
Technical violation	Yes= 1	33	78.6	24	82.8	9	69.2		0.87
Number of technical violations									
Mean number of violations		3.0		2.9		3.3		0.62	
Mode number of violations		1.0		1.0		1.0 & 4.0			
Median number of violations		3.0		3.0		4.0			
Range number of violations		1-6		1-6		1-6			

T-test of Independent Samples and Chi-Square * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

randomly sampled and those who were conveniently sampled had a mean age of first arrest of twenty-four. A large percentage of both groups had served a prior probation sentence. There were no significant differences between prior probation history, mean number of probation, violation of prior probation, mean number of violations, and mean number of new law violations.

In terms of incarceration, there were no significant differences between the random sample and convenience sample in prior jail history, mean number of jail sentences, mean longest jail sentence, prison history, mean number of prison sentences, mean longest prison sentence, and parole history. A small percentage of each group had served at least one prison sentence, while more had served a jail sentence. There was no significant difference in being sentenced to alternative sanctions. More specifically, there were no significant differences in having been sentenced to electronic monitoring, intensive supervision probation, day reporting, and boot camp between the two groups. In both groups, boot camp had the greatest percentage of individuals reporting to have received that sentence. There was also no significant difference between pretrial release violations and receiving pretrial diversions.

Current probation. Between the random sample and convenience sample there was no significant difference in the amount of public order offenders, drug offenders and violent offenders (Tables 3-11 and 3-13). The majority of both samples were public order offenders, while drug offenders composed a small percentage of both samples. No significant differences were noted in terms of accepting probation as a plea bargain and having reduction in number of charges, number of counts or offense level. Most

had accepted their current charges as a result of plea bargain and experienced some sort of reduction of their charges. Additionally, no significant difference was found between the amount of time served on probation at the point of the interview; both samples had served roughly five months on probation.

The randomly sampled individuals and the conveniently sampled individuals were not significantly different in receiving a violation of probation on their current term of probation. The majority of both samples did not receive a violation and of those who received a violation, the majority received a violation for a technical violation(s) versus a new law violation. The samples did not significantly differ in presence of new law violations, mean number of new law violations, presence of technical violations and mean number of technical violations. Overall, the random sample and convenience sample were not significantly different in the majority of sample characteristics collected from official and interview data.

Differences

Only six sample characteristics were significantly different between the random sample and convenience sample (Table 3-13). Of the person characteristics, age, mean number of children and length of stay in one's neighborhood were significantly different. The convenience sample was significantly younger with a mean age of thirty-three (versus thirty-seven) ($t = -2.33$, $p = .022$). The random sample had on average roughly three children (versus two children) ($t = 2.32$, $p = .008$). Those randomly sampled lived in their currently neighborhood longer than those conveniently sampled ($t = 2.72$, $p = .066$).

The only characteristic related to the sample's prior criminal history that was significantly different between the random sample and convenience sample was the

mean of the longest prior probation sentence ($t = -2.90$, $p = .005$). Of those who had previous sentences of probation, the random sample's longest probation sentence was nearly twice as long as the convenience sample. In terms of their current probation sentence, the convenience sample had significantly more property offenders than the random sample ($X^2 = 5.70$, $p = .017$). A possible explanation is some of the probation officers who were most willing to help us recruit had a large number of property offenders on their caseloads. The final characteristic that was significantly different was the length of probation sentence. The samples differed by approximately one month.

In summary, the random sample and convenience sample significantly differed in age, mean number of children, length of stay in neighborhood, mean of longest prior probation sentence, property offenders and length of probation sentence. However, the majority of sample characteristics were not found to be significantly different. Overall, the samples were not significantly different in the majority of personal characteristics, adult justice system history characteristics and current probation characteristics, as well as all juvenile justice system history characteristics. The limited amount of significant differences between the convenience sample and the random sample suggests that the two samples are comparable.

Analysis

The analysis for this study utilized techniques for both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative responses¹ were the primary data source and the qualitative responses were used as follow-ups to assist in interpreting the quantitative data. The

¹ Missing data was handled through listwise deletion, meaning a record was excluded from analysis if one value was missing. This explains the different Ns seen during different analysis. It was decided to use listwise deletion because in most cases, the missing responses were due to the probationer not having the particular condition.

expectation in using this method was to obtain a clear in-depth understanding of probationers' perception of the conditions of probation, especially as it relates to severity, difficulty and potential obstacles.

Descriptive statistics, such as percentage and frequency tables were utilized for Research Question 1 (what conditions are probationers sentenced to in Alachua County?). For Research Question 2a (do the conditions of probation fall on a continuum when it comes to severity? If so, which conditions are viewed as being most severe?), percentage and frequency tables were utilized. Following the frequencies, correlations were run to examine possible correlations between the dependent variables (scales and scale items) and independent variables (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, prior probation sentence, current offense type, etc.). Once it was determined there were variables with significant relationships, ordinary least squares linear (OLS) regression was run. Since OLS regression was used the dependent variables pertaining to perceived severity were coded 1= *not severe*, 2= *somewhat severe*, 3= *severe* and 4= *extremely severe*. Content analysis of the transcribed interviews was used to further help answer Research Question 2a.

The same procedure was used for Research Question 2b (do probationers' views of the severity of a condition impact their perceived ability to complete a particular probation condition?). Frequencies and correlations were run. OLS regressions were estimated using the variables with significant relationships. The perceived difficulty dependent variables were coded 1= *not difficult*, 2= *relatively easy*, 3= *about 50/50*, 4= *somewhat difficult*, and 5= *very difficult*. The qualitative data obtained to answer Research Question 2b was analyzed by coding and examining the data for themes.

Qualitative examples that supported or expanded the results from the quantitative data were noted.

Research Question 2c (what do probationers see as potential obstacles that would hinder them from completing or adhering to the conditions of their probation?) was also analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative data. First, frequencies were run followed by correlations in order to examine the relationships between the obstacle dependent variables and independent variables. OLS models were estimated with the variables with significant relationships. The dependent variables were coded 1= *strongly disagree*, 2= *disagree*, 3= *agree*, and 4= *strongly agree*. The qualitative questions were examined for possible themes that matched or contradicted what was found from the quantitative results.

Chapter Summary

This chapter described the methodology that the study utilized. It described and discussed the target population, as well as the recruitment techniques used. The method of data collection, including both official and self-reported data, was presented. The official data measuring instrument and the interviewing instrument were described in detail. The next section described in detail both the dependent and independent variables utilized in this study. The interviewed sample's characteristics were discussed and the final section described the data analysis techniques that were utilized.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 1—THE CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

The first research question this report hopes to answer is, “what are the conditions of probation that clients face in Alachua County?” This will be accomplished by reporting the frequencies and percentages of each possible probation condition received by the interviewees. In order to answer this research question, I recorded the conditions of probation for each of the 202 interviewees using official court records and probationers’ probation files. Additionally, the interviewees reported which probation conditions applied to them. Both the official and interview data collection instrument included thirty-two¹ probation conditions. The conditions were believed to be commonly utilized conditions and were selected based on a review of the probation program’s website, an examination of individuals’ sentencing reports on LINDAS, and conversations with Court Services’ employees. Based on the tradition in the literature (Clarke, 1979; Petersilia, 1997a), each of the conditions of probation can be classified as a standard, treatment or punitive condition. Interestingly, there were few discrepancies between what the official records indicated were conditions and what the interviewees believed were their conditions.

Standard Conditions of Probation

Standard conditions are probation conditions that are imposed on all the probationers under a particular probation agency (Clarke, 1979; Petersilia, 1997a). The probationers were asked about eleven conditions that generally are standard across probation agencies (Table 4-1). Nine of the eleven conditions are standard in Alachua

¹ The data collection instruments included the condition of participation in the Daily Alternative Reporting Tracking (DART) program. However, it was later discovered that probationers do not receive this condition.

County Probation. In a person’s sentencing paperwork, the standard conditions are typically listed in paragraph form at the top of the page; the conditions are not individually listed. The only exception is the court cost, which is individually listed.

Table 4-1. Standard conditions based on official data versus self-report data

	Official Data		Interview Data	
	N	%	N	%
Commit no new law violation	202	100.0	166	82.2
Report to probation office monthly	202	100.0	201	99.5
Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer (PO)	202	100.0	198	98.0
Notify PO of changes in residence	202	100.0	195	96.5
Notify PO of changes in employment/education	202	100.0	181	89.6
Try to obtain employment	0	0.0	86	42.6
Maintain employment/school enrollment	0	0.0	92	45.5
Allow PO to visit residence	202	100.0	137	67.8
Allow PO to visit employment site	202	100.0	98	48.5
Pay monthly cost of supervision (COS)	201	99.5	187	92.6
Mean COS (in dollars)	48.71		52.05	
Mode COS (in dollars)	50.00		50.00	
Median COS (in dollars)	50.00		50.00	
Range COS (in dollars)	5.00-50.00		10.00-100.00	
Pay court cost	202	100.0	171	84.7
Mean court cost (in dollars)	751.76		652.45	
Mode court cost (in dollars)	236.00		1000.00	
Median court cost (in dollars)	688.00		472.00	
Range court cost (in dollars)	235.00-2644.00		30.00-2500.00	

All 202 probationers interviewed officially received the conditions of: commit no new law violation, report to probation office monthly, answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer, notify probation officer of changes in residency and notify probation

officer of changes in employment/education. At least 97% of those interviewed indicated that they had the condition of reporting monthly to the probation office, were required to answer truthfully to all probation officer' questions and had to notify their probation officer of changes in their living situation. While 97% (N= 194, 96.5%) of the interviewees acknowledged that they were required to notify their probation officer about changes in residence, slightly fewer (N= 181, 89.6%) acknowledged having to notify their probation officer about changes in employment and/or education². Interestingly, 18% (N= 36, 17.8%) did not think part of their probation sentence prohibited them from being arrested and/or charged with committing a new crime.

Probationers were also asked if their probation conditions included the conditions of trying to obtain employment and maintain employment and/school enrollment. Though not required conditions for Alachua County Probation, these conditions are often standard conditions in many probation agencies. Despite none of the interviewees being assigned either condition, over a third of the sample thought the conditions were required (Table 4-1). Forty-three percent (N= 86, 42.6%) of the interviewees thought their probation required them to obtain employment and 46% (N= 92, 45.5%) indicated they had the probation condition of maintaining employment and/or school enrollment. Individuals may have thought they were current probation conditions for them because previous probation sentences may have required them to obtain and maintain employment/school enrollment. Additionally, some of the probation officers

² Since the conditions (commit no new law violation, report to probation office monthly, answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer, notify probation officer of changes in residency and notify probation officer of changes in employment/education, and obtain and maintain employment/education) applied to all the probationers or none of the probationers, I was unable to use chi-square to note any differences between the official and interview data.

may have strongly encouraged their clients to obtain and maintain employment/school enrollment, which the probationers interpreted as being required.

A 100% of the interviewees' probation orders included the conditions that their probation officer was allowed to visit the probationers' residence and employment site (Table 4-1). However, only 68% (N= 137, 67.8%) of the interviewees thought their probation entitled their probation officer to visit their home. Almost one-third of interviewees did not know that as part of their probation order, the officer was allowed to visit their residence. Likewise, fewer than 50% (N= 98, 48.5%) of the probationers interviewed believed that they had a condition which allowed their probation officer to visit their employment site.

Only one of the probationers interviewed had his or her cost of supervision waived by the judge, meaning 201 of the interviewees (99.5%) were assigned to pay the monthly a cost of supervision fee (Table 4-1). The cost of supervision fee is the fee probationers pay for being on probation and is meant to reduce the amount that taxpayers pay for probation services. Ninety-three percent (N= 187, 92.6%) of the interviewees indicated having to pay the cost of supervision, so in general they understood that they had this condition. Both official and self-report data showed that probationers typically were required to pay fifty dollars a month. All 202 interviewees were court-ordered to pay court costs, which are fines and fees given to them by the court system. Again, most, but not all of the interviewed (N= 171, 84.7%) reported having court costs. I used chi-square to see if there were any differences between the official and interview data regarding the monthly cost of supervision and court costs. There were no statistically significant differences between the official and interview data.

Overall, most interviewees correctly reported the standard conditions of their probation, but fewer than half thought their probation officer could visit their employment site.

Treatment Conditions of Probation

Treatment conditions refer to conditions that are specific to a probationer and require him or her to address a problem or need (Clarke, 1979; Petersilia, 1997a). On the sentencing paperwork, these conditions are listed individually. Probationers were asked about eleven possible treatment conditions (Table 4-2). However, official records often did not distinguish between the conditions of submitting to random screens like breathalyzers and/or urinalysis, not possessing or consuming alcohol and not possessing or consuming illegal drugs. Therefore, when reporting official estimates it is not possible to separate the three conditions. Fifty-two percent (51.5%) of the interviewees' records indicated that they were ordered to submit to random screens and not allowed to possess/consume alcohol or illegal drugs. Interview data showed over 70% (N= 148, 73.3%) of those interviewed had at least one of those three conditions. Nearly 60% (N= 116, 57.4%) of interviewees reported being required to submit to random screens, while over 60% reported not being able to possess or consume alcohol (N= 122, 60.4%) and not court-ordered to no possess and consume illegal drugs (N= 130, 64.4%). Despite the interview estimates being higher than official estimates regarding submitting to random screens and not possessing and/or consuming alcohol and/or illegal drugs, there were no significant differences between the official and interview data.

Official records also did not always distinguish between alcohol treatment and drug treatment. Therefore, I recorded that substance abuse treatment was required but did not distinguish whether it was for alcohol or drugs. Only 10% (N= 20, 9.9%) of the

probationers' files indicated that participation in substance abuse treatment was required (Table 4-2). Interview data showed that 30% (N= 60, 29.7%) of those interviewed reported being required to participate in substance abuse treatment. More specifically, 22% (N= 45, 22.3%) of interviewees reported being required to participate in alcohol treatment, and 13% (N= 26, 12.9%) reported being required to participate in drug treatment. Only a small percentage of probationers' official records indicated being required to participate in a substance abuse program, while a larger percentage of probationers' self-reports indicated required participation. However, no statistical differences were noted.

Table 4-2. Treatment conditions based on official data versus self-report data

	Official Data		Interview Data	
	N	%	N	%
Submit to random screens and do not possess or consume substances	104	51.5	148	73.3
Submit to random screens			116	57.4
Do not possess/consume alcohol			122	60.4
Do not possess/consume drugs			130	64.4
Participate in substance abuse treatment	20	9.9	60	29.7
Participate in alcohol treatment			45	22.3
Participate in drug treatment			26	12.9
Participate in mental health treatment	10	5.0	17	8.4
Participate in employment program	0	0.0	1	0.5
Complete Milepost class	2	1.0	2	1.0
Complete batterer's intervention	33	16.3	30	14.9
Complete anger management	13	6.4	24	11.9
Attend a driver's class	81	40.1	78	38.6

The differences in percentages may be due to differences in probationer officers' recordkeeping. The information about required substance abuse treatment was

primarily recorded from the probationers' probation file and there are differences among probation officers in record-keeping. Some probation officers may not have listed whether substance abuse treatment was required for the probationers on their caseload. In other words, though the probationer was evaluated and identified as needing substance abuse programming, his or her probationer officer did not always record that in the probationer's probation file. This more than likely led to the differences between official and interview estimates, since I collected whether probationers' were assigned to substance abuse programming from probationers' files.

Only 5% (N= 10, 5.0%) of the interviewees' official records indicated the condition of mental health treatment (Table 4-2). Eight percent (N= 17, 8.4%) of the interviewees self-reported this condition. Both official and self-report estimates indicated that a small percentage of probationers were required to participate in mental health treatment. Using chi-square, I determined there were no differences between the two data sources. Though they were not significantly different, the difference in percentages was more than likely due to the same reason there were differences in substance abuse treatment percentages. Mental health treatment participation was recorded from probationers' probation files and the differences are most likely due to some probation officers not listing that mental health treatment was required in the probationers' files.

None of the interviewed sample was court-ordered to participate in an employment program³, though one person (0.5%) self-reported being required to participate in an employment program. Employment programs typically are geared to aid probationers in

³ Due to official records indicating the condition of participating in an employment program did not apply to any of the probationers, I was not able to use chi-square to note any differences between the official and interview data.

finding and maintaining employment. The programs assist probationers with their resumes, job searches, and interviewing. It is possible that the probationer's probation officer suggested attending an employment program to the probationer, which the probationer understood as being a required condition.

One percent (N=2, 1.0%) of the interviewees' records and 1% (N=2, 1.0%) of the self-report data showed that completion of the Milepost class was a condition. There were no significant differences noted when chi-squares were utilized. Milepost class is a course that is often given to those charged with petit theft, which typically involves a person taking property valued as being more than 100 dollars but less than 300 dollars. Individuals who are on probation for the offense of shoplifting/ retail theft can also be assigned to Milepost class. The purpose of the class is to help the offender identify theft as being a crime and to expose the offender to the effects of theft on others (i.e., recognize victims) (L. Collopy, personal communication, June 18, 2011).

Official and interview data estimates were similar for the condition of completing batterer's intervention. Batterer's intervention is a course typically given for those charged with domestic battery, while anger management is typically given to those with battery, but is not limited to those people. Only 6% (N= 13, 6.4%) of interviewees' official record indicated having a condition requiring them to complete anger management, while double that percentage (N= 24, 11.9%) self-reported being required to participate in anger management (Table 4-2). There were no statistical significant differences noted when I ran chi-squares for either batterer's intervention or anger management. Probationers' official sentence often indicated anger management as a condition of probation, but sometimes it was later assigned after an evaluation. The

difference in percentages is more than likely due to difference in probation officers' recordkeeping because in cases where the condition was later assigned, I relied on probation officers' records. Not all the probation officers may have noted the condition being assigned. Only a small portion of the probationers received the condition of anger management, while more received the condition of batterer's intervention.

Individuals with driving offenses can be assigned to participate in a course that focuses on driving, such as a driving under the influence (DUI) substance abuse course, an advanced DUI substance abuse course or a driver's improvement course. Forty percent (N= 81, 40.1%) of the interviewed sample was court-ordered to complete some sort of driver's course; self-report estimates were similar (N= 78, 38.6%) (Table 4-2). When I ran chi-squares there were no differences noted between the official records and self-report records regarding the condition of participating in a driver's improvement course.

In summary, over half of those on probation were required to submit to random screens and not allowed to possess or consume alcohol/drugs, while over a third were required to attend driver's course. A small percentage received the remaining treatment conditions, with the exception of substance abuse programming. The differences between official and self-report estimates were likely due to official records not being complete. However, none of the differences were statistically different.

Punitive Conditions of Probation

Punitive conditions are meant to increase the invasiveness and punitiveness of probation as a way to reflect the seriousness of the offense (Petersilia, 1997a). These conditions were also listed individually on the probationers' sentencing paperwork. The interview instrument asked probationers about ten conditions of probation. Forty-six

percent (N= 93, 46.0%) of the official records indicated the option of completing community service hours in lieu of paying cost of supervision or court fees, while 38% (N= 77, 38.1%) self-reported having this option (Table 4-3). This condition allowed probationers to complete community service hours instead of paying a portion of their monthly cost of supervision or court costs. The exchange rate is one hour of community service work equates to ten dollars. For the condition of completing community service hours in lieu of paying, the official data and self-report data were similar, and no statistical differences were noted.

Forty-two percent (N= 85, 42.1%) of the probationers were court-ordered to complete mandatory community service hours; interview data estimates were similar (N= 89, 44.1%) (Table 4-3). When I ran chi-squares there were no differences between official and self-report data. According to both the official and self-report data, the mean number of community services hours was sixty hours. Over a third of the sample received the condition.

While probationers are able to select their community service location, work crew is organized by Alachua County Court Services and requires individuals to perform specific tasks (e.g., moving county offices' furniture, picking up trash). Work crew also has specific hours during the day when individuals are required to report and typically the individuals have to work four or eight hours at a time. Twelve percent (N= 25, 12.4%) of the official records indicated the condition of performing work crew days; 18% (N= 37, 18.3%) self-reported having that condition (Table 4-3). Despite the self-report estimates being over-reported, the difference was not statistically significant. Fewer than 20% of the sample was assigned to participate in work crew.

Table 4-3. Punitive conditions based on official data versus self-report data

	Official Data		Interview Data	
	N	%	N	%
Complete community service (CS) hours in lieu of fees	93	46.0	77	38.1
Mean (in hours)	74.0		66.0	
Mode (in hours)	24 & 69		24	
Median (in hours)	64		45	
Range (in hours)	24-220		8-745	
Complete mandatory CS hours	85	42.1	89	44.1
Mean (in hours)	60.1		60.2	
Mode (in hours)	50		50	
Median (in hours)	50		50	
Range (in hours)	20-200		5-200	
Complete work crew days	25	12.4	37	18.3
Mean (in days)	11.8		13.2	
Mode (in days)	5 & 10		3 & 10	
Median (in days)	10		10	
Range (in days)	3-30		1-68	
Complete a jail sentence	39	19.3	33	16.3
Mean (in days)	29.6		31.4	
Mode (in days)	60		30	
Median (in days)	11		30	
Range (in days)	1-180		1-68	
Pay restitution	19	9.4	24	11.9
Mean restitution (in dollars)	1041.43		889.91	
Mode restitution (in dollars)	500.00 & 1000.00		50.00 & 1000.00	
Median restitution (in dollars)	537.38		221.00	
Range restitution (in dollars)	48.55-7226.83		50.00-7500.00	
No contact with victim	44	21.8	41	20.3
Attend victim impact panel	61	30.2	68	33.7
Driver's license suspended/revoked	66	32.7	97	48.0
Mean (in months)	11.1		13.2	
Mode (in months)	6		6	
Median (in months)	6		6	
Range (in months)	6-60		1-90	
Abide with order of impoundment	53	26.2	47	23.3
Abide by curfew	0	0.0	0	0.0

Nineteen percent (N= 39, 19.3%) of interviewees' court records indicated receiving a condition to serve a jail sentence (Table 4-3). During the interview, slightly fewer (N=33, 16.3%) of interviewees reported having the condition. According to both data sources, the mean jail sentence was approximately thirty days and there were no statistical differences noted. The punitive condition of paying restitution was court-ordered in 9% (N= 19, 9.4%) of all interviewees' cases, with the mean restitution being over a thousand dollars (\$1,041.43). According to interview data, 12% (N= 24, 11.9%) reported having to pay restitution, with the mean restitution being roughly nine hundred dollars (\$889.91). I noted no statistical differences between the two data sources. Roughly 20% of the sample received the condition of a jail sentence, while roughly 10% were required to pay restitution as part of their probation sentence.

Similar estimates were found for the punitive conditions of not having contact with victim(s) and attending a victim impact panel. Approximately 20% of the official records and self-report estimates indicated the condition of no contact with victim(s) (Table 4-3). The estimates were similar and were not statistically different. This condition required the probationer to have no contact with the victim or victims involved in the case. Victims were often individuals but in the case of probationers serving probation for property offenses (e.g., petit theft, trespassing, etc.) probationers often receive a no contact with a victim order that forbid them to go to certain locations and/or enter certain business.

The condition of victim impact panel is regularly given to those with alcohol-related driving charges (i.e., DUI and reckless driving with alcohol) and often requires probationers to listen to individuals who lost love-ones due to an alcohol-related driving

offense or individuals who killed someone in an alcohol-related driving offense speak about their experiences. Thirty percent (N= 61, 30.2%) of interviewed sample were required to attend a victim impact panel, while 34% (N= 68, 33.7%) of them self-reported receiving the condition (Table 4-3). The difference between the two data sources was not statistically different. The slight difference may be due to some probation officers recommending to their caseload attending the panel in order to receive five hours of community service, though the probationers were not court-ordered to attend.

As part of their probation, a third of the interviewees (N= 66, 32.7%) had their driver's license suspended or revoked (Table 4-3). On average, most had their driver's license suspended for eleven months. However, nearly 50% (N= 97, 48.0%) of the interviewees reported having their driver's license suspended or revoked, with the average time of suspension being thirteen months. The difference in estimates may be due to individuals reporting the condition when the suspension is due to a different probation case. It is also possible that some already had their driver's license suspended and assumed that their current case would also include that condition. Though there was a difference noted, when I ran chi-squares the difference was not statistically significant. A sizable portion of the probationers had their drivers' licenses suspended or revoked as part of their probation.

The punitive condition of abiding by order of impoundment of one's vehicle was received by roughly a quarter of those interviewed according to both data sources. When I performed chi-squares I noted no significant differences between the two sources. Probationers whose vehicles were impounded typically were serving probation

for DUI and their vehicles were often impounded for ten days. Both sources indicated that none of the interviewees received a condition requiring them to abide by a curfew⁴, which was final punitive condition included in the interview instrument (Table 4-3).

Overall, the estimates for the punitive conditions based on official data were similar to interview data. The only exception was the condition of having one's driver's license suspended or revoked. In that case, it is possible that the probationers were over-reporting having been assigned the condition due to them having their driver's licenses suspended on another case or already having their driver's licenses suspended and assuming their current cases would reiterate the suspension. However, there were no statistically significant differences noted between the two data sources' estimates.

Additional Conditions of Probation

Both the criminal history form (Appendix D) and the interview instrument (Appendix G) had spaces to record thirty-two common probation conditions. If official records indicated additional conditions of probation, I recorded the additional conditions (Questions 114-118). In the case of the self-report data, the probationers were asked to indicate whether there were any conditions that they were required to complete or adhere to other than the conditions included in the survey (Question 173). When the probationers indicated there were additional conditions, the interviewer would record the additional conditions. The official records indicated a total of nineteen additional probation conditions given to the interviewees (Table 4-4). The nineteen additional probation conditions can be classified as either a treatment condition, meant to address

⁴ I was not able to use chi-square since the estimates from both sources were zero.

a probationer's specific problem or need, or as a punitive condition, meant to reflect the seriousness of probationer's offense.

Additional Treatment Conditions

There were six additional treatment conditions that were given to interviewees. One of the conditions required the individual to take his or her prescribed psychotropic medicine, which would be prescribed him or her to help manage his or her mental and/or emotional disorder. This was assigned to only 1% (N= 2, 1.0%) of the interviewed sample (Table 4-4). Fewer than 2% of the sample (N= 3, 1.5%) received the condition to attend Alcoholic or Narcotics Anonymous. Only one probationer (0.5%) received the condition banning him or her from entering a bar or club. In the case of the three previously listed additional treatment conditions, none of the interviewees during their interview reported having received the condition⁵.

The treatment condition of participating in a psychosocial, an in-depth mental health evaluation, was court-ordered for one interviewee; one person indicated the condition during the interview data (Table 4-4). Nearly 3% (N= 5, 2.5%) of the interviewed sample received the additional treatment condition of participating in a parenting class. Parenting classes typically help individuals build healthy parenting skills and include such topics as setting boundaries, communication, anger management and stages of discipline. Two percent (N= 4, 2.0%) of the interviewed sample reported having received the condition. The final additional treatment condition was to comply with the Department of Children and Families' (DCF) plan and it was only

⁵ None of the probationers reported having received the conditions of: take psychotropic medicine, attend Alcoholic/Narcotics Anonymous meeting, no bars or clubs, and comply with Department of Children and Families' plan. Therefore, I was unable to run chi-squares.

found in one case (0.5%). A DCF plan is usually used in cases where the children have been removed or are in danger of being removed for the home, and the plan is used to ensure the children are not removed or are allowed to return. None of the probationers indicated having received this condition.

Table 4-4. Additional conditions based on official data versus self-report data

	Official Data		Interview Data	
	N	%	N	%
Treatment Conditions				
Take psychotropic medicine	2	1.0	0	0.0
Attend Alcoholic/Narcotics Anonymous meetings	3	1.5	0	0.0
No bars or clubs	1	0.5	0	0.0
Psychosocial evaluation	1	0.5	1	0.5
Parenting class	5	2.5	4	2.0
Comply with Department of Children and Families' plan	1	0.5	0	0.0
Punitive Conditions				
Payment plan	5	2.5	0	0.0
Pay State Attorney's fee	7	3.5	1	0.5
Buy out community service hours (\$10 per hour)	5	2.5	0	0.0
Work crew days in lieu of fees	5	2.5	0	0.0
No contact with children under 12	1	0.5	0	0.0
No employment involving children	1	0.5	0	0.0
Resign from teaching	1	0.5	0	0.0
Letter of apology	4	2.0	2	1.0
Impound gun/rifle	2	1.0	1	0.5
Provide vehicle identification number	11	5.4	0	0.0
Obtain driver's license	9	4.5	1	0.5
Restricted driver's license	11	5.4	2	1.0
Ignition interlock device	24	11.9	10	5.0

Overall, there were only six additional treatment conditions given to probationers not already included in the data collection instruments. These conditions were rarely given and in most cases the probationers did not indicate having received the condition. There were no significant differences noted between official and self-report estimates.

Additional Punitive Conditions

There were eleven additional conditions recorded from official data that could be classified as a punitive condition. Fewer than 3% (N= 5, 2.5%) of the interviewed sample received the condition requiring them to pay their court costs on a court-ordered payment plan (Table 4-4). This condition was typically given to individuals who were on probation for writing worthless checks and consisted of the probationers receiving payment schedules of when they were required to pay off each of the worthless check they wrote. None of the interviewees indicated having a payment plan condition⁶.

Roughly 4% (N= 7, 3.5%) were assigned to pay a State Attorney's fee, though fewer than 1% (N= 1, 0.5%) of the sample reported the condition. The difference was not statistically different. A State Attorney's fee requires the probationer to pay a fee to the State Attorney's office in an effort to recoup some of the money it cost the State to prosecute the person. The conditions of court-ordered payment plan and State Attorney's fee were only assigned to a small percentage of the probationers.

A small percentage (N=5, 2.5%) of the probationers' sentences had the condition allowing the probationers to "buy out" their community service hours by paying ten dollars for every hour they were assigned (Table 4-4). For example, people who had twenty hours of community service could pay two hundred dollars instead of performing their community service hours. In roughly 3% (N=5, 2.5%) of the records, probationers were allowed to do work crew days in lieu of paying their fees as opposed to performing community service in lieu of paying their fees. None of those interviewed reported

⁶ Since none of the participants reported receiving the conditions of payment plan, buying out community service hours, work crew days in lieu fees, no contact with child, no employment involving children, resign from teaching, and provide VIN, I was unable to determine statistically if there were differences.

receiving either of the previously mentioned conditions, while official recorders indicated less than 3% had received the conditions.

One person (0.5%) who was serving a misdemeanor probation sentence for a sex offense was court-ordered to not have any contact with children under the age of twelve (Table 4-4). Another probationer (0.5%) who was serving probation for assaulting students in his or her class (as a teacher) received the conditions of no employment involving children and resign from teaching. Neither probationer reported the additional conditions.

On rare occasions, probationers were assigned the condition of writing a letter of apology (Table 4-4). Often the letter of apology was addressed to the police officer who arrested the probationer. Another additional punitive condition required the probationers to impound their guns/rifles. Only 1% (N= 2, 1.0%) of the files had this condition, while fewer than 1% (N=1, 0.5%) of interviewees reported it. When I ran chi-squares there were no significant differences noted between the two data sources regarding the conditions of writing an apology letter and impounding their weapons.

Several additional punitive conditions were given to individuals serving probation for a driving offense (Table 4-4). Five percent (N=11, 5.4%) of the interviewees were required to provide their vehicle's identification (VIN) number, though none self-reported having to do so. Roughly 5% (N= 9, 4.5%) were court-ordered to obtain a valid driver's license. Instead of having their driver's license suspended or revoked, 5% (N= 11, 5.4%) had restrictions placed on their driver's license limiting where and/or when they can drive. Twelve percent (N= 24, 11.9%) of the official records had the condition of ignition interlock device, which is a breathalyzer installed in a car's dashboard and

prevents the car from starting if there is alcohol present. Only 5% (N= 10, 5.0%) of the sample reported having this condition. In the case the additional punitive conditions pertaining to vehicles or licenses, self-report estimates were less than the official estimates. However, when I performed chi-squares none of differences were statistically significant.

In summary, according to official records there were several additional punitive conditions given to those on probation. These additional punitive conditions were rare and not often assigned to many probationers. In terms of self-report estimates, those interviewed often did not report having the additional punitive conditions and when they did report the conditions the self-report estimates were lower than the official estimates. However, the noted differences were not statistically significant.

Chapter Summary

In order to answer Research Question 1, “what are the conditions of probation that clients face in Alachua County,” the frequencies and percentages of the probation condition received by the interviewees based on official and interview data were reported. Eight of the eleven standard probation conditions applied to all 202 interviewees. Most of the interviewees reported having received the standard conditions of probation, with the exception of the condition of probation officers visiting their probationers’ employment sites. Over half of the probationers’ official records indicated at least one treatment condition, with the percentage being higher in interview data. With the exception of the condition of having the driver’s license suspended or revoked, official estimates for the ten punitive conditions were similar to self-report estimates. Nineteen additional probation conditions were present in official records, which could be classified as additional treatment conditions or additional punitive

conditions. In the case of the additional conditions, they were not commonly assigned and often the interviewees did not report having been assigned these additional conditions. None of the standard, treatment, punitive and additional probation conditions' official and self-report estimates was significantly different. This indicated that probationers were familiar with their probation conditions and knew what conditions they were required to adhere to or complete in order for them to successfully complete probation.

CHAPTER 5 RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 2A— SEVERITY OF CONDITIONS

The second research question this report hopes answer is, “what are probationers’ perceptions of their conditions of probation?” This will be accomplished by answering three sub-research questions. The first sub-question is “do the conditions of probation fall on a continuum when it comes to severity? If so, which conditions are viewed as being most severe?” I will answer this question by first examining participants’ survey responses. I will next report correlation results, and the results from the regressions that were conducted on items significantly correlated at the bivariate level. Finally, qualitative data are examined in order to determine whether they explain or expand the survey results.

Quantitative Analysis

Percentages and Frequencies: Severity of Probation Conditions

As previously mentioned, past researchers typically use one of three methods to assess severity (i.e., magnitude estimation, comparative judgments and offender-generated). However, I decided that these approaches were not feasible in the current study and instead used a Likert scale to assess severity, which has been used in the past to assess the difficulty of probation conditions in incarcerated populations (Petersilia & Deschenes, 1994a) (Measures section for more details). Interviewees were asked to indicate whether they felt each of the thirty-two listed probation conditions were *not severe* (1), *somewhat severe* (2), *severe* (3) or *extremely severe* (4). I then ran exploratory factor analysis and created eight severity scales. Additionally, I created three severity scales based on previous literature (Dependent Variables section for more details).

Mean scores

The means for seven of the eight scales ranged from 1.6 to 2.4; when rounded the mean scores indicated the response of *somewhat severe* (Tables 5-1 and 5-2 and Appendix J for estimates based on subsample). The scales' items that composed the seven scales also had mean scores that indicated the response of *somewhat severe*. The two exceptions were the items, complete a jail sentence and pay court costs, whose mean scores corresponded to the response of *severe*. The mean score for the final scale, "punitive-restrictive scale" was 2.5 and when rounded indicated the response of *severe*. However, two of the scale's items, abide by order of impoundment and abide by curfew, had mean scores that indicated a response of *somewhat severe*, while the remaining scale item, driver's license suspended and/or revoked, had a mean score that indicated *severe*. Overall, the mean scores indicated that probation conditions to be either *somewhat severe* or *severe*. None of the mean scores for the scales or scale items indicated the response of *not severe* or *extremely severe*.

Factor analysis-based scales

I next examined the percentage of interviewees' responses per scales' items (Table 5-1). For the first scale, "routine condition scale" at least 62% of the participants indicated the five standard conditions that compose the scale to be *not severe*; for three of the items the percentage indicating a response of *not severe* was over 70%. The majority of the interviewees indicated the "routine condition scale's" items to be *not severe*. There was a similar pattern for the "offender specific scale" and the "offense specific scale." However, the percentage indicating *not severe* was slightly lower in the two scales in comparison to the "routine condition scale." In the case of the "offender specific scale," at least 55% identified the scale items as being *not severe*, while for the

Table 5-1. Percentages for severity scales based on factor analysis

Scales based on factor analysis	N	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	Mean
Routine Condition Scale						
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	198	68.2	12.1	9.6	10.1	1.6
Item 2: Report to probation once a month	202	61.9	15.8	11.4	10.9	1.7
Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	202	75.2	7.4	9.4	7.9	1.5
Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence	202	75.7	8.4	10.4	5.4	1.5
Item 5: Notify PO of changes in Employment	197	72.1	12.2	10.2	5.6	1.5
Offender Specific Scale						
Item 1: Participate in mental health treatment	133	54.9	18.0	21.1	6.0	1.7
Item 2: Participate in employment program	127	56.7	22.0	16.5	4.7	1.7
Item 3: Complete batterer's intervention	124	56.5	16.1	18.5	8.9	1.8
Item 4: Complete anger management	126	57.1	14.3	23.0	5.6	1.8
Item 5: No contact with victim	124	59.7	16.1	12.1	12.1	1.8
Item 6: Attend one victim impact panel	151	60.9	19.9	12.6	6.6	1.7
Offense Specific Scale						
Item 1: Submit to random screens	180	52.2	17.2	17.2	13.3	1.8
Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol	185	54.6	21.1	14.1	10.3	1.8
Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	185	73.0	9.2	9.7	8.1	1.5
Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment	163	52.1	21.5	20.2	6.1	1.8
Item 5: Participate in drug treatment	141	46.1	24.8	21.3	7.8	1.9
Item 6: Attend driver's course	160	49.4	25.0	19.4	6.3	1.8
Punitive-Activity Scale						
Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours	181	38.1	25.4	19.9	16.6	2.3
Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	169	48.5	21.3	16.6	13.6	2.0
Item 3: Complete work crew days	145	32.4	15.9	28.3	23.4	2.4
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	153	22.9	10.5	29.4	37.3	2.8

Likert Scale: Not severe= 1, Somewhat severe= 2, Severe= 3, and Extremely severe= 4

Table 5-1. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	N	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	Mean
Punitive-Restrictive Scale						2.5
Item 1: Driver's license suspended/revoked	167	18.0	18.6	22.8	40.7	2.9
Item 2: Abide with order of impoundment	153	34.6	16.3	26.8	22.2	2.4
Item 3: Abide by curfew	120	31.7	13.3	34.2	20.8	2.4
Standard-Financial Scale						2.4
Item 1: Pay monthly cost of supervision	198	26.3	33.8	22.7	17.2	2.3
Item 2: Pay court costs	195	21.5	29.2	25.1	24.1	2.5
Standard-Visit Scale						1.8
Item 1: Allow PO to visit residence	196	57.1	24.0	9.2	9.7	1.7
Item 2: Allow PO to visit employment site	187	48.1	24.6	11.2	16.0	2.0
Standard-Employment Scale						1.7
Item 1: Try to obtain employment	187	56.7	17.1	12.8	13.4	1.8
Item 2: Maintain employment/enrollment	186	61.3	19.4	11.8	7.5	1.7

Likert Scale: Not severe= 1, Somewhat severe= 2, Severe= 3, and Extremely severe= 4

“offense specific scale” it was least 46%. In sum, at least half and typically the majority felt these conditions were *not severe*. These conditions were mainly composed of standard conditions and treatment conditions.

In comparison to the three previously discussed scales, there was greater variance in the reporting of severity among the probationers for the conditions that compose the “punitive-activity scale” (Table 5-1). The two scale items that focus on community service had similar percentages with a slight majority indicating the conditions to be *not severe*, and fewer than 20% indicating the conditions to be *extremely severe*. For the third scale item, complete work crew days, 32% (N= 47, 32.4%) of the interviewees reported the condition to be *not severe*. However, nearly 28% (N= 41, 28.3%) indicated the condition to be *severe* and 24% (N= 34, 23.4%) indicated the condition to be *extremely severe*, so more thought this was a severe condition. The final scale item, complete a jail sentence, only had 23% (N= 35, 22.9%) of the sample report the condition to be *not severe*. The majority of the interviewees for a jail sentence to be either *severe* (N= 45, 29.4%) or *extremely severe* (N= 57, 37.3%), meaning that restricting their freedom was more severe than the condition asking them to abide by rules or participate in programming.

The “punitive-restrictive scale” was composed of three items, one of which was the item that had more interviewees reporting the condition to be *extremely severe* than any other condition (Table 5-1). The condition of having one’s driver’s license suspended or revoked had only 18% (N= 30, 18.0%) of the sample reporting the condition to be *not severe*. Forty-one percent (N= 68, 40.7%) of the interviewees identified the condition to be *extremely severe*, making it the condition with the most participants identifying it as

extremely severe. The other two conditions that composed the scale had roughly a third of the interviewees reporting the conditions to be *not severe*, and slightly more than 20% reporting them to be *extremely severe*. The conditions comprising the “punitive-restrictive scale” were reported by probationers as being more severe than the previously discussed scales, except for the “punitive-activity scale.” This indicated that probationers considered the conditions that restricted their freedom were more severe than the majority of standard and treatment conditions, which mainly comprise previous scales.

The “standard-financial scale’s” two scale items were the only conditions where the highest response category indicated the response of *somewhat severe*. In other words, in the case of most conditions, respondents reported the conditions to be *not severe* but for these two conditions respondents reported them to be *somewhat severe* (Table 5-1). Twenty-six percent (N= 52, 26.3%) of the sample indicated paying the monthly cost of supervision to be *somewhat severe* and 24% (N= 57, 29.2%) indicated paying court costs was *somewhat severe*. Financial conditions were more burdensome than all previously mentioned conditions, except for the conditions of completing a jail sentence and having one’s driver’s license suspended or revoked.

The remaining two scales that were created using factor analysis had similar estimates as each other (Table 5-1). At least 48% of the interviewees felt the scales items were *not severe*. At most only 16% of those interviewed reported the conditions comprising the two scales as being *extremely severe*. A large portion of the probationers identified the conditions requiring probationers to obtain and maintain employment and allowing probationer officers to visit probationers’ homes and

employment sites as being *not severe*. Overall, the factor analysis-based scales' items were often identified as being *not severe*, which suggests that most conditions were viewed as being *not severe* (Table 8-1 lists the conditions on a continuum based on *extremely severe* responses percentages).

Literature-based scales

Using the same thirty-two probation conditions that were used in the factor analysis-based scales, I created three scales composed of the conditions that fall into the classification established in the literature (i.e., standard, treatment and punitive) (Clarke, 1979; Petersilia, 1997a). The “severity standard scale” was composed of the eleven standard probation conditions, and as before most though they were *not severe*. For eight of the standard conditions, more than 55% of the sample identified the conditions as being *not severe* (Table 5-2). In most cases the percentages were greater than 65%. A small percentage of the interviewees identified the eight standard conditions as being *extremely severe*. The remaining three standard conditions had fewer than 50% of those sampled indicate the condition to be *not severe*. However, in the case of the standard condition, allow probation officer to visit employment site, slightly fewer than 50% (N= 90, 48.1%) reported it being *not severe*. The two financial standard conditions had fewer interviewees indicating the conditions to be *not severe* and more indicating the conditions to be *extremely severe*. For most of the standard conditions, the majority of the probationers identified the conditions as being *not severe*. The exceptions were the conditions of paying monthly cost of supervision and court costs; less than a third of the probationers considered the conditions to be *not severe*.

Table 5-2. Percentages for severity scales based on literature

Scales based on literature	N	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	Mean
Severity Standard Scale						1.8
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	198	68.2	12.1	9.6	10.1	1.6
Item 2: Report to probation once a month	202	61.9	15.8	11.4	10.9	1.7
Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	202	75.2	7.4	9.4	7.9	1.5
Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence	202	75.7	8.4	10.4	5.4	1.5
Item 5: Notify PO of changes in employment	197	72.1	12.2	10.2	5.6	1.5
Item 6: Try to obtain employment	187	56.7	17.1	12.8	13.4	1.8
Item 7: Maintain employment/enrollment	186	61.3	19.4	11.8	7.5	1.7
Item 8: Allow PO to visit residence	196	57.1	24.0	9.2	9.7	1.7
Item 9: Allow PO to visit employment site	187	48.1	24.6	11.2	16.0	2.0
Item 10: Pay monthly cost of supervision	198	26.3	33.8	22.7	17.2	2.3
Item 11: Pay court costs	195	21.5	29.2	25.1	24.1	2.5
Severity Treatment Scale						1.7
Item 1: Submit to random screens	180	52.2	17.2	17.2	13.3	1.9
Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol	185	54.6	21.1	14.1	10.3	1.8
Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	185	73.0	9.2	9.7	8.1	1.5
Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment	163	52.1	21.5	20.2	6.1	1.8
Item 5: Participate in drug treatment	141	46.1	24.8	21.3	7.8	1.9
Item 6: Participate in mental health treatment	133	54.9	18.0	21.1	6.0	1.8
Item 7: Participate in employment program	127	56.7	22.0	16.5	4.7	1.7
Item 8: Complete Milepost class	101	58.4	13.9	21.8	5.9	1.8
Item 9: Complete batterer's intervention	124	56.5	16.1	18.5	8.9	1.8
Item 10: Complete anger management	126	57.1	14.3	23.0	5.6	1.8
Item 11: Attend driver's course	160	49.4	25.0	19.4	6.3	1.8

Likert Scale: Not severe= 1, Somewhat severe= 2, Severe= 3, and Extremely severe= 4

Table 5-2. Continued

Scales based on literature	N	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	Mean
Severity Punitive Scale						2.3
Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours	181	38.1	25.4	19.9	16.6	2.2
Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	169	48.5	21.3	16.6	13.6	2.0
Item 3: Complete work crew days	145	32.4	15.9	28.3	23.4	2.4
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	153	22.9	10.5	29.4	37.3	2.8
Item 5: Pay restitution	138	35.5	26.8	23.9	13.8	2.2
Item 6: No contact with victim	124	59.7	16.1	12.1	12.1	1.8
Item 7: Attend one victim impact panel	151	60.9	19.9	12.6	6.6	1.7
Item 8: Driver's license suspended/revoked	167	18.0	18.6	22.8	40.7	2.9
Item 9: Abide with order of impoundment	153	34.6	16.3	26.8	22.2	2.4
Item 10: Abide by curfew	120	31.7	13.3	34.2	20.8	2.4
Overall Severity Scale						1.9
All thirty-two conditions						

Likert Scale: Not severe= 1, Somewhat severe= 2, Severe= 3, and Extremely severe= 4

Eight of the eleven scale items' that compose the "severity treatment scale" had 50 to 60% of the interviewees indicate the condition to be *not severe* (Table 5-2). Between 5 and 13% of the interviewed sample reported the eight conditions as being *extremely severe*. Two of the remaining "severity treatment scale's" items had only slight fewer than 50% of the sample identifying the conditions to be *not severe*. The item, participate in drug treatment had 46% (N= 65, 46.1%) reporting the condition as *not severe* and the item, attend a driver's course, had 49% (N= 79, 49.4%) saying the same. The final item had over 70% (N= 135, 73.0%) of the interviewees reporting that not possessing or consuming drugs was *not severe*, while only 8% (N= 15, 8.1%) indicated the item to be *extremely severe*. Nearly all the treatment conditions had half of the sample indicating that the condition was *not severe*.

There was more variance among the ten items that composed the "severity punitive scale." The two punitive items that focused on victims (i.e., no contact with victim and attend victim impact panel) had roughly 60% of the sample identifying the conditions to be *not severe* (Table 5-2). However, 12% (N= 15, 12.1%) of the sample identified the condition of no contact with victim was *extremely severe*, while only 7% (N= 10, 6.6%) indicated attending a victim impact panel as being *extremely severe*. In the case of the condition, complete community service hours in lieu of fees, slightly fewer than 50% (N= 82, 48.5%) indicated a response of *not severe* and 14% (N= 23, 13.6%) indicated a response of *extremely severe*. Five of the ten punitive conditions had 30 to 40% of the interviewees indicating the conditions to be *not severe*. The five conditions had 17 to 23% of the sample identify the conditions to be *extremely severe*. The two conditions identified as being the most severe probation conditions were both

punitive conditions. Nearly 40% (N= 57, 37.3%) of the interviewees reported the condition of completing a jail sentence was *extremely severe*, while slightly greater than 40% (N= 68, 40.7%) reported having one's driver's license suspended and/or revoked was *extremely severe*. With the exception of attending a victim impact panel, the punitive conditions were viewed as being more severe than standard and treatment conditions.

Summary of frequencies and percentages

Five of the eight scales created based on factor analysis had the majority of respondents indicating that the scales' items were *not severe*. With the exception of the two standard financial conditions, the items that compose the "severity standard scale" and the "severity treatment scale" were perceived to be less severe than the scale items comprising the "severity punitive scale." The punitive conditions were generally understood to be more severe as a punishment than the other conditions (Table 8-1 lists the conditions on a continuum based on *extremely severe* responses percentages). The condition with the largest of probationers identifying it as *not severe* was notifying the probation officer of changes in residence. Similarly, the condition of answering truthfully to inquiries by probation officer was considered to be *not severe* by a large majority of people. One of the most severe conditions was to complete a jail sentence (N= 57, 37.3%). However, the condition that was most often reported as being the *extremely severe* was having one's driver's license suspended and/revoked, with 41% (N= 68, 40.7%) of the interviewees identifying the condition as being *extremely severe*. Overall, most conditions included in the interview instrument were viewed as being *not severe*.

Correlations and Regressions: Severity of Probation Conditions

Following the frequencies, I ran correlations with the dependent and independent variables for the severity of conditions (Tables 5-3, 5-4 and 5-5 and Appendix K for correlations by scale item). There were twenty-three independent variables used which were classified as personal characteristics, previous criminal history and current offense and probation sentence. The personal characteristics included *age, race, gender, ethnicity, marital status, parental status, years of education, employment status* and *sample*. The previous criminal history independent variables were presence of *previous history, seriousness history, prior violent offense, prior probation, prior violation, jail history* and *prior sentence history*, while the current offense and probation sentence variables were *current offense type, violent offense, plea bargain, charge level reduction, violation of probation, new law violation* and *technical violation*. After running the correlations, I ran regressions using the variables that were correlated at the bivariate level (Appendix L for regression tables that included all the independent variables). Ordinary least squares linear (OLS) regression was used.

Factor analysis-based scales

I ran correlations with the eight severity scales created by factor analysis and the twenty-three independent variables and OLS regression with the variables significantly correlated at the bivariate level.

Routine condition scale. For the first scale, “routine condition scale,” only two independent variables were significant at the bivariate level, *age* and *race* (Table 5-3). I

ran an OLS model predicting the “routine condition scale” with *age* and *race*¹. *Age* (b= -0.01, p=0.018) and *race* (b= -0.34, p=0.005) remained significant in the multivariate model (Table 5-6). Younger interviewees and non-Whites were more likely to find the conditions comprising the “routine condition scale” to be severe than older interviewees and Whites. Those who are older and White probationers were more likely to report that abiding by the law, reporting once a month, answering truthfully, and notifying probation officers of changes in residences and employment sites as being less severe than younger and non-White probationers.

Offender specific scale. *Prior sentence history*, *new law violation* and *technical violation* were significant at the bivariate level (Tables 5-4 and 5-5). The current offense and probation sentence variables, *new law violation* and *technical violation* were not predictors of the “offender specific scale” when the others variables were controlled, but *prior sentence history* (b= -0.08, p=0.004) was significant (Table 5-6). Individuals with more extensive criminal sanction histories were more likely find the conditions of participating in: mental health treatment, employment programming, batterer’s intervention, anger management, victim impact panel and having no contact with the victim to be less severe than those with less extensive criminal sanction histories.

Offense specific scale. One independent variable, *age*, was significantly correlated with the “offense specific scale” (Table 5-3). Next, OLS regression was run with “offense specific scale” as the dependent variable and *age* as the independent

¹ I used two collinearity diagnostic factors to assessed multicollinearity for all the regressions estimated. None of the variables had a tolerance value below 0.40 or had a variance inflation factor (VIF) above 2.0. Based on the collinearity diagnostic factors, multicollinearity was not a problem in any of the models.

Table 5-3. Correlations of severity scales and personal characteristics variables

	Correlations of Severity Scales and Personal Characteristics Variables								
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Scales based on factor analysis									
Routine Condition Scale	-0.15*	-0.18*	-0.04	-0.05	-0.11	0.02	-0.11	0.07	0.03
Offender Specific Scale	-0.14	-0.05	-0.04	0.02	-0.06	0.08	0.03	0.09	-0.07
Offense Specific Scale	-0.21*	-0.03	-0.02	-0.05	-0.15	-0.09	0.02	0.09	0.12
Punitive-Activity Scale	0.00	0.00	-0.06	0.02	-0.12	0.03	0.08	0.12	-0.08
Punitive-Restrictive Scale	-0.08	-0.04	-0.02	0.03	-0.14	-0.05	0.07	0.07	0.14
Standard-Financial Scale	-0.03	0.02	-0.17*	0.15*	-0.01	0.03	-0.08	-0.01	-0.02
Standard-Visit Scale	-0.11	-0.02	0.04	-0.09	0.04	-0.09	0.17*	0.05	-0.03
Standard-Employment Scale	-0.16*	-0.20**	0.02	-0.01	-0.13	0.04	-0.13	-0.16*	-0.00
Scales based on literature									
Severity Standard Scale	-0.14	-0.17*	-0.07	-0.04	-0.10	0.03	-0.08	-0.01	0.00
Severity Treatment Scale	-0.17	-0.12	-0.02	0.00	-0.14	0.03	0.01	0.23*	0.13
Severity Punitive Scale	-0.04	-0.05	-0.09	-0.03	-0.14	0.07	0.09	0.03	-0.05
Overall Severity Scale	-0.10	-0.22	-0.05	-0.01	-0.18	0.10	0.05	0.17	0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 5-4. Correlations of severity scales and previous criminal history variables

	Correlations of Severity Scales and Previous Criminal History Variables						
	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Scales based on factor analysis							
Routine Condition Scale	0.02	0.04	0.03	-0.03	0.04	-0.02	-0.02
Offender Specific Scale	-0.03	-0.17	0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.17	-0.20*
Offense Specific Scale	-0.16	-0.12	-0.05	-0.03	-0.01	-0.15	-0.15
Punitive-Activity Scale	-0.03	-0.10	-0.07	-0.00	-0.14	-0.08	-0.07
Punitive-Restrictive Scale	0.02	-0.04	0.00	0.07	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08
Standard-Financial Scale	-0.06	-0.11	-0.12	-0.02	-0.03	-0.11	-0.07
Standard-Visit Scale	-0.05	0.07	0.00	0.00	-0.07	-0.09	-0.05
Standard-Employment Scale	0.13	0.18*	0.10	-0.01	0.08	0.08	0.06
Scales based on literature							
Severity Standard Scale	0.03	0.06	0.03	-0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.00
Severity Treatment Scale	-0.07	-0.09	0.02	0.06	0.04	-0.14	-0.15
Severity Punitive Scale	0.06	-0.08	0.01	0.10	-0.09	-0.08	-0.09
Overall Severity Scale	0.02	-0.01	0.05	0.09	0.06	-0.05	-0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 5-5. Correlations of severity scales and current offense and probation sentence variables

	Correlations of Severity Scales and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables						
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation
Scales based on factor analysis							
Routine Condition Scale	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.04	0.12	0.14
Offender Specific Scale	0.08	0.14	0.17	0.10	-0.05	0.24*	0.23*
Offense Specific Scale	-0.06	-0.03	0.11	0.05	-0.01	0.08	0.06
Punitive-Activity Scale	0.06	0.11	0.10	0.14	-0.14	0.03	0.06
Punitive-Restrictive Scale	0.10	0.10	0.18	0.10	-0.08	0.09	0.10
Standard-Financial Scale	0.02	0.02	-0.09	-0.04	-0.03	0.16*	0.14
Standard-Visit Scale	-0.07	-0.06	-0.00	0.05	-0.07	0.12	0.08
Standard-Employment Scale	0.14	0.06	0.07	-0.05	0.08	0.15*	0.12
Scales based on literature							
Severity Standard Scale	0.04	0.03	-0.03	-0.00	0.04	0.19*	0.18*
Severity Treatment Scale	0.03	0.06	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.17
Severity Punitive Scale	0.12	0.13	0.23*	0.09	-0.09	0.10	0.09
Overall Severity Scale	0.13	0.10	0.20	0.01	0.06	0.17	0.17

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

variable (Table 5-6). *Age* ($b = -0.01$, $p = 0.017$) was a significant predictor of the scale, indicating that as age increased the likelihood of reporting the scale items to be severe decreased. Older people thought submitting to random screens, not possess or consuming alcohol and/or drugs, and participating in alcohol treatment, drug treatment and/or a driver's course was less severe than younger people participating in the study.

Punitive-activity scale. None of the twenty-three independent variables were correlated at the bivariate level, and therefore no regressions were run with the "punitive activity scale" (Tables 5-3, 5-4 and 5-5).

Punitive-restrictive scale¹. No regressions were run with the "punitive-restrictive scale" because the variables were not correlated at the bivariate level (Tables 5-3, 5-4 and 5-5).

Standard-financial scale. Three independent variables were correlated with the "standard-financial scale" at the bivariate level. *Gender*, *ethnicity* and *new law violation* were significantly correlated (Tables 5-3 and 5-5). A model predicting the scale with *gender*, *ethnicity* and *new law violation* as predictors was run and all variables were significant (*gender*: $b = -0.42$, $p = 0.004$; *ethnicity*: $b = 0.62$, $p = 0.027$; *new law violation*: $b = 0.52$, $p = 0.017$) (Table 5-6). Women were more likely to indicate the conditions comprising the scale to be severe than men, while Hispanics are more likely to indicate the conditions to be severe than non-Hispanics. Additionally, those probationers who

¹ I ran regression models for each of the scales with all the independent variables, regardless of whether the independent variables were significant at the bivariate level. One independent variable was identified as a significant predictor when an OLS model was estimated with all the independent variables and the dependent variable, "punitive-restrictive scale" (Appendix L). *Sample* ($b = 0.40$, $p = 0.041$) was a significant predictor, and indicated that those who were conveniently sampled were more likely to report the scale's conditions to be severe. It is possible that when combined with the other variables, its joint predictive capability was seen. However, it should be noted that the predictive capability of the model is non-existent or limited because the F-statistic was non-significant.

violated probation due to new law violations were also more likely to find the two financial conditions comprising the scale to be severe than interviewees with no new law violation.

Table 5-6. Predicting conditions of probation's severity- factor analysis-based scales

Scale			
Routine Condition Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Age	-0.01*	0.00	-0.17
Race	-0.34**	-0.12	-0.20
Constant	2.18	0.20	
R-square	0.06		
Adjusted R-square	0.05		
Standard error of the estimate	0.81		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	6.18**		
N	194		
Offender Specific Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Prior sentence history	-0.08*	0.04	-0.20
New law violation	0.30	0.30	0.13
Technical violation	0.26	0.23	0.15
Constant	1.74	0.11	
R-square	0.11		
Adjusted R-square	0.08		
Standard error of the estimate	0.75		
Degrees of freedom	3		
F-value	3.74*		
N	99		
Offense Specific Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Age	-0.01*	0.00	-0.21
Constant	2.27	0.21	
R-square	0.05		
Adjusted R-square	0.04		
Standard error of the estimate	0.74		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	5.82*		
N	124		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 5-6. Continued

Scale			
Standard-Financial Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Gender	-0.42**	0.15	-0.21
Ethnicity	0.62*	0.28	0.16
New law violation	0.52*	0.22	0.17
Constant	2.58	0.12	
R-square	0.09		
Adjusted R-square	0.07		
Standard error of the estimate	0.96		
Degrees of freedom	3		
F-value	5.87**		
N	192		
Standard-Visit Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Years of education	0.09*	0.04	0.17
Constant	0.63	0.53	
R-square	0.03		
Adjusted R-square	0.02		
Standard error of the estimate	0.99		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	5.14*		
N	183		
Standard-Employment Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Age	-0.01*	0.00	-0.18
Race	-0.28	0.15	-0.15
Employment status	-0.23	0.14	-0.12
Seriousness history	0.03	0.01	0.13
New law violation	0.30	0.21	0.10
Constant	2.36	0.26	
R-square	0.11		
Adjusted R-square	0.09		
Standard error of the estimate	0.89		
Degrees of freedom	5		
F-value	4.46**		
N	179		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Standard-visit scale. The only independent variable correlated at the bivariate level with the “standard-visit scale” was years of education (Table 5-3). I ran ordinary least squares regression with “standard-visit scale” as the dependent variable and *years of education* as the independent variable (Table 5-6). *Years of education* ($b= 0.09$, $p= 0.025$) was a significant predictor of the scale¹. As years of educational attainment increased so did the likelihood of the interviewees reporting that probation officers visiting their residence and employment sites were severe.

Standard- employment scale². The “standard-employment scale” had the most variables correlated at the bivariate level. *Age*, *race*, *employment status*, *seriousness history*, and *new law violation* were all significantly correlated (Tables 5-3, 5-4 and 5-5). Using OLS regression, I determined that *race*, *employment status*, *seriousness history* and *new law violation* were no longer significant once I controlled for the other variables. *Age* ($b= -0.01$, $p= 0.016$) was the only significant predictor (Table 5-6). As age increased the likelihood of individuals reporting the scales to be severe decreased. Older interviewees were more likely to report that obtaining and maintaining employment to be less severe than younger interviewees.

¹ Though *seriousness* was not correlated at the bivariate level, when I ran OLS regression with all the independent variables, *seriousness* ($b= 0.08$, $p= 0.032$) was a significant predictor. Probationers with more serious criminal histories were more likely to report the conditions of their probation officers visiting their homes and employment sites to be severe. The significant relationship may be due to chance or due to *seriousness* needing to be in conjunction with other variables in order for the relationship to appear. The F-statistics was non-significant, indicating the model had little or no predictive capability.

² As was the case with the reduced models, *age* ($b= -0.02$, $p= 0.043$) was a predictor of the “standard-employment scale” when the full model was run (Appendix L). Those who are younger were more likely to report the scale’s conditions being severe. The variable, *age*, may have become significant due to chance or because when combined with other variables, its joint predictive capability is seen. It should be noted that the predictive capability of the model may be limited, because the F-statistic was non-significant.

Literature-based scales

I also ran correlations with the severity scales created based on the literature, the “overall severity scale” and the twenty-three independent variables: nine personal characteristics variables, seven previous criminal history variables, and seven current offense and probation sentence variables. In comparison to the factor analysis-based scales, there were fewer variables significant at the bivariate level for the literature-based scales.

Severity standard scale³. The first literature-based scale had three independent variables significant at the bivariate level; *race*, *new law violation* and *technical violation* were significant (Tables 5-3 and 5-5). I ran an OLS model predicting the “severity standard scale” with *race*, *new Law violation*, and *technical violation* (Table 5-7). However, none of the variables remained significant once OLS regressions were estimated. There were no significant predictors for the standard conditions comprising the scale.

Severity treatment scale. *Employment status* was significant at the bivariate level (Table 5-3), but in the OLS regression this variable was not a significant predictor of the “severity treatment scale” (Table 5-7).

Severity punitive scale. One independent variable, *plea bargain*, was significantly correlated with the “severity punitive scale” (Table 5-5). I ran OLS regression with the scale as the dependent variable and *plea bargain* as the

³ For each literature-based severity scale, I ran a regression model with all twenty-three independent variable regardless of whether the variables were significant at the bivariate level. *Age* was a significant predictor of the “severity standard scale” ($b = -0.01$, $p = 0.049$) (Appendix L). As age increased the likelihood of reporting the conditions as being severe decreased. When I ran the full models some variables that were not significant at the bivariate level became significant when all the variables were placed in the model. It is possible that *offense type* does not predict well individually, but does jointly. However, since the F-statistic was non-significant, there is little to no predictive capability in the model.

Table 5-7. Predicting conditions of probation's severity- literature-based scales

Scale			
Severity Standard Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Race	-0.20	0.10	-0.15
New law violation	0.28	0.22	0.14
Technical violation	0.10	0.18	0.06
Constant	1.87	0.09	
R-square	0.06		
Adjusted R-square	0.05		
Standard error of the estimate	0.66		
Degrees of freedom	3		
F-value	3.65*		
N	170		
Severity Treatment Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Employment status	0.01	0.00	0.17
Constant	1.69	0.08	
R-square	0.03		
Adjusted R-square	0.02		
Standard error of the estimate	0.72		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	2.71		
N	92		
Standard Punitive Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Plea bargain	0.41*	0.19	0.23
Constant	1.91	0.17	
R-square	0.06		
Adjusted R-square	0.04		
Standard error of the estimate	0.69		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	4.94*		
N	86		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

independent variable (Table 5-7). *Plea bargain* ($b= 0.41$, $p=0.029$) was a significant predictor of the scale⁴. Those who indicated having received their current probation as a result of a plea bargain were more likely to report the punitive conditions to be severe than those who were not serving their current probation sentence as a result of a plea bargain.

Overall severity scale⁵. No regressions were run with the “overall severity scale” since none of the variables were correlated at the bivariate level (Tables 5-3, 5-4 and 5-5).

Summary of correlations and regressions

Few variables were correlated at the bivariate level. In the case of two factor analysis-based scales and “overall severity scale,” none of the variables were found to be significantly correlated. None of the scales had more than five variables correlated. For the factor analysis-based scales, most of the variables remained significant once OLS regressions were run, while only one variable was significant predictor for one of the literature-based scale. Having the presence of a *new law violation*, *age* and *race* were found to be significant predictors for multiple severity scales. The independent variables *marital status*, *parental status*, *sample*, *previous history*, *prior violent offense*,

⁴ I ran OLS regression with all the independent variables and “severity punitive scale” as the dependent variable and *employment status* ($b= 0.405$, $p= 0.032$) was significant (Appendix L). Individuals who were employed were more likely to report the punitive conditions to be severe. When combined with other variables, their predictive model may be seen, though the model itself had limit to no predictive power because the F-static was non-significant.

⁵ Two independent variables were identified as significant predictors when an OLS model was estimated with all the independent variables and the “overall severity scale” (Appendix L). *Race* ($b= -0.44$, $p= 0.036$) and *employment status* ($b= 0.59$, $p= 0.001$) were significant when the model was run with all the variables. Individuals who were non-White and those who were employed were more likely to report the conditions of probation as being severe than Whites and those unemployed. When combined with the other variables, their joint predictive capability was seen, though the predictive capability of the model is non-existent or limited because the non-significant F-statistic.

prior probation, prior violation, jail history, current offense type, violent offense, charge level reduction, and violation of probation were not significant at the bivariate level for any of the eleven severity scales. Overall there were few significant predictors of perceived conditions' severity possibly because there is little variance in responses; a large portion of the probationers who responded consider most probation conditions to be *not severe*.

Qualitative Analysis

A criticism of previous severity research is that researchers did not address what severity means to the participant and why he or she indicated the severity rankings he or she selected (Von Hirsch et al., 1992). I attempted to address this criticism. For each condition that the interviewee reported as being *extremely severe*, I asked why the person felt the condition was *extremely severe*. Additionally for each condition that the interviewee reported as being *not severe*, I asked why he or she felt the condition was *not severe*. The participant's responses were recorded with a digital-recorder and later transcribed. Roughly 80% (N= 159, 78.7%) of the interviews were recorded. In the cases where the interview was not recorded, the interviewer took detailed notes (Data Collection section for more details). I analyzed the qualitative data by coding and examining the data for themes. The content analysis of the transcribed interviews was used to further help answer Research Question 2a, which pertains to severity.

Standard Conditions of Probation

Not severe

No new law violation. Two major themes emerged from the qualitative data regarding the first standard condition (Table 5-8). The first theme was that probationers considered the condition of abiding by the law to be *not severe* since they do not

typically commit crime. Individuals would state they did not have a history of committing crime, nor did they plan to commit any future crime(s). For example, a forty year-old, White man, serving probation for a public order offense, stated “I don’t plan on doing it, haven’t done it in the past,” while a forty-three year-old, White woman, serving probation for a violent offense, shared, “it’s not severe because I have no plans in breaking any laws. Um I don’t consider myself habitual in any means and [laughter] I ya, I don’t think, I mean that just does not affect me.” These sentiments are repeated by others.

Probationers also appeared to base their ranking of *not severe* on the idea that committing a new law violation violates a societal rule. It appears they do not see the condition as being a term of their probation but instead being something greater than their probation sentence. When asked a sixty-four year-old, Black, male, violent offender stated, “we have a standard of how we should live anyway. And we know the difference between right, right from wrong, so you need to be able to be rule followers.” During her interview, a forty year-old, White, female, public order offender responded “we should be abiding by the laws anyway,” while a twenty year-old, White woman, sentenced for a public order offense responded, “I mean, um, like I feel like I shouldn’t be doing that anyways like some things illegal, it’s the fact that it’s already illegal, like, means that I shouldn’t be doing it at all.” Probationers who identified the condition of committing no new law violations as being *not severe* did so because they typically abided by the laws and/or because they felt not breaking the laws was part of societal norms and a greater obligation than just a probation condition.

Report to the probation office once a month. The second condition had three major themes with the first theme emerging being that the condition was a reasonable

Table 5-8. Standard conditions of probations' qualitative themes

Condition	Not Severe	Extremely Severe
Commit no new law violation	Do not regularly do so Societal norm	Consequence too great
Report once a month	Reasonable Not difficult Good idea	Consequence too great Time consuming
Answer truthfully	Nothing to hide Do not regularly do so	Get in trouble
Notify if changes in residence	Reasonable Not difficult	Not appropriate for charges
Notify if changes in employment	Reasonable Not difficult	Not appropriate for charges
Try to obtain employment	Should work Good idea	Hindered by probation Economy
Maintain employment/school	Maintained in past Necessary	Hindered by probation
Allow PO to visit residence	Good idea Reasonable Nothing to hide	Intrusive
Allow PO to visit employment	Good idea Reasonable Nothing to hide	Intrusive
Pay monthly cost of supervision	Reasonable Flexible	Consequences too great Expensive Paying for own supervision
Pay court costs	Reasonable Flexible	Consequences too great Expensive

condition (Table 5-8). "I expect them to keep track of me, and that seems like the most reasonable way to do it" was the response given by a sixty-two year-old, White man, who is serving probation for a public order offense. A twenty-one year-old, White,

female, public order offender stated, “it’s not severe because, I mean, they have to know what’s going on with you and keep track of your cases or anything like that.” The sentiment that it is a reasonable condition was shared by many of the interviewed probationers.

The second theme that emerged from the *not severe* qualitative responses was that reporting monthly to the probation agencies was not difficult. A thirty-one year-old, White, male, public order offender explained that “it’s just once a month, it takes five minutes to go in there, it’s easy.” Similarly a forty-six year-old, White, female, public order offender concurred by saying “it’s, it’s not a problem, I mean it’s only once a month.”

The final theme that emerged regarding this condition was that probationers felt that the condition was a good idea. A thirty year-old, White, male probationer sentenced for a public order offense stated:

actually, it’s not a bad thing ‘cause you know it keep track of what you doing through the month, and you know it’s just the thing that, it’s just like what you got to put your mind to. If, I know I got a report why should I be hanging out in the streets somewhere you know try’na do something when I’m try’na get off of papers. So, it’s a good thing.

A thirty-five year-old, Black, female, drug offender shared “I think that’s good for um keeping tabs on people to make sure they don’t fall back into bad habits,” while a thirty-one year-old, Black, female probationer, who is on probation for a violent offense, stated, “it keep me in touch with the one that supervising me, and I can show and prove to her that it’s an accurate report for me trying to make better of my situations.” The three themes that emerged regarding the condition of reporting once a month was that the condition was reasonable, not difficult to complete, and a good idea.

Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer. Through content analysis, I extracted two major themes with regard to being honest with the probationer officer (Table 5-8). The first theme was that probationers felt the condition was *not severe* because they did not feel like they had anything to lie about. “I ain’t got nothing to hide,” was a comment made by a forty-five year-old, White, female, public order offender and was expressed by others. The second theme was that the interviewees reported that they do not lie, so the condition was *not severe* for them. A forty-eight year-old, White woman, who was on probation for a public order offense, stated “I always tell the truth,” while a thirty year-old, White, male, violent offender stated “I’ve never been much of a liar anyways.” Those who identified condition as being *not severe* did so because they did not feel they had anything to lie about or because they did not typically lie.

Notifying probation officer of changes in residence and notifying probation officer of changes in employment. The two conditions regarding notifying probation officer of any changes in either living situation and/or employment had the same two main themes (Table 5-8). The first theme being that probationers thought the condition was reasonable. A sixty-two year-old, White man, public order offender stated “they have to know where you are in order to keep track of you.” A forty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender concurred with the statement, “so they can keep up with you.”

Content analysis demonstrated that the two standard conditions were thought of as being *not severe* because the conditions were thought to be easy to accomplish. A majority of the probationers indicated that notifying the probation officer was simple. “All I have to do is call them so it’s not big of a deal” was reported by a thirty-four year-old,

White, man serving probation for a public order offense. A twenty-nine year-old, White, male, public order offender shared that he felt the conditions were “simple to do.” The two reasons individuals considered the conditions of notifying their probation officers of changes in living situations and employment were because they felt the conditions were reasonable and/or thought they were easy to accomplish.

Try to obtain employment. The qualitative data showed that one of the themes among probationers reporting the condition to be *not severe* was that they felt everyone should be required to work regardless of being on probation (Table 5-8). “You should work” was reported by a thirty year-old, Black, female, public order offender and was an opinion expressed by others. The second theme that emerged was that some probationers appeared to feel that encouraging probationers to obtain employment was a good idea. A forty-one year-old, Black, male, public order offender shared that “it’s a good thing. It’s to help you. It’s great you get your work on, you get money in your pocket and you can take care of the things you can take care of.” Another male probationer, who was fifty-eight years old, White and a public order offender stated that “if you’re at work, you can’t be out there committing crime.” Obtaining employment was identified as being *not severe* because individuals felt they should have a job regardless of probation and because people felt it was a good idea.

Maintain employment/school enrollment. I extracted two major themes from the responses regarding this condition (Table 5-8). Several probationers reported that they felt the maintaining employment/school enrollment was *not severe* because they maintained employment in the past or have maintained their currently employment for a while. A thirty-four year-old, Black, male, violent offender reported “my last job that I

just had, uh, I was there for about six years,” while another male probationer, who was twenty-five years old, White and a public order offender stated “um, I’m not in danger of getting fired, I’m not, you know I don’t have a bad track record with keeping jobs.”

The second theme among those who reported the condition was *not severe* was that they would maintain employment/school enrollment regardless of being on probation. “I need to have a job” was a comment by a forty year-old, White, female, public order offender, but was one that repeated by other interviewees. The two reasons probationers considered maintaining employment to be *not severe* was because they had been able to maintain employment in the past and that they would maintain probation regardless of the probation condition requiring them to do so.

Allow probation officer to visit residence and allow probation officer to visit employment site. From the content analysis the same three themes emerged for the two conditions that pertain to probation officer’s visits (Table 5-8). Many probationers reported feeling the conditions were a good idea and therefore *not severe*. A thirty-five year-old, Black, female, drug offender summed up this view by saying “they need to keep tabs on you. I think it keeps people out of trouble, keeps them from falling into bad habits again.”

Probationers also felt that the conditions were reasonable. A fifty year-old, White, male, public order offender stated, “it’s what they are supposed to do or allowed to do or required to do.” Another probationer, who was a Black, female, property offender stated, “he needs to be able to check up on you make sure you are where you say you are, make sure you’re doing what you’re supposed to be doing.”

The final theme that emerged was that probationers reported that they had nothing to hide from their probation officer so a visit would not be concern for them. “I have nothing to, um, hide from her” is a statement made by a sixty year-old, White, male, public order offender but was a statement repeated by probationers when asked about the conditions. The conditions of probationers visiting their homes and employment sites were perceived as being *not severe* because the probationers considered the conditions to be good idea, reasonable, and/or have nothing they need to hide from the probationer officers.

Pay monthly cost of supervision and pay court cost. There were two themes that the standard financial conditions had in common (Table 5-8). It appears that probationers reported the conditions were *not severe* because they felt the condition was reasonable. A thirty-five year-old, Black, male, drug offender stated “they’re just doing their job, and I mean it’s not easy for them to keep tabs on us, so they deserve their money.” A twenty-six year-old, White, female probationer, who was serving a sentence for a public order offense concurred and stated “I did it. I should have to pay for something, should be accountable for what you do.” A twenty-five year-old, Black, female, property offender also concurred and stated “the state still shouldn’t pay for my mistake if I made a mistake with the law.” The second shared theme that emerged was that probationers felt that the probation agency will work with them if they were having difficulty paying. “They give you leeway. They work with you” was a comment made by a forty-two year-old, Black, male, violent offender but was a reoccurring sentiment among other probationers.

The condition of paying monthly cost of supervision had an additional theme, which was that probationers felt the cost of supervision was not expensive. A twenty-two year-old, White, female, public order offender's comment of "the price, it's not too bad" highlights this theme. Paying the standard financial conditions were identified as being *not severe* due to the conditions being reasonable and the agency being willing to work with the probationers. The condition of paying the monthly cost of supervision had the additional theme that the monthly cost was not expensive.

Extremely severe

No new law violation. One theme emerged from the qualitative data from those who reported the condition of remaining law-abiding as being *extremely severe* (Table 5-8). The theme that emerged was that they felt the consequences for violating the condition was too severe. A forty-eight year-old, Black, male, public order offender's statement highlighted this theme the best; "if I ended up breaking another law while I was still paying the consequences for the first one, then the end results gonna be ten times as bad as it would be." The only theme identified among those who reported abiding by the law was *extremely severe* was that the consequences for not complying with the condition were too high.

Report to the probation office once a month. With regards to reporting once a month, again some felt it was *extremely severe* because of the possible consequences for violation (Table 5-8). "I think it's extremely severe, that is, I don't do it then I'm going to jail" was a statement given by a forty-five year-old, White, male, public order offender but was an opinion shared by many of those who felt the condition was *extremely severe*. Other probationers felt the condition was *extremely severe* because it was time consuming. A thirty-one, year-old, White woman, who was serving probation for a

public order offense, stated it was “time consuming because have to take off work, lose money.” Reporting to the probation agency monthly was considered to be *extremely severe* because of the consequences for violating the condition and because it is too time consuming to complete.

Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer. Through content analysis, I extracted one theme regarding being truthful to the probation officer (Table 5-8). The theme was that probationers felt that being honest could lead to them getting in trouble. When asked why they indicated the condition to be *extremely severe*, probationers made comments similar to a thirty-three, Black, female, public order offender’s comment of “I don’t wanna get in trouble.”

Notifying probation officer of changes in residence and notifying probation officer of changes in employment. The content analysis demonstrated that only one theme emerged regarding the two conditions being *extremely severe* (Table 5-8). Those who reported the conditions to be *extremely severe* appeared to feel so because the conditions did not relate to their charges. “For my charges, I don’t think I should have to” was a statement made by a thirty-three year-old, Black, female, public order offender but was common response among other probationers who reported the conditions to be *extremely severe*. The theme that individuals thought having to notify their probation officers of changes in their residences and employment was not necessary considering their charges was the only theme identified.

Try to obtain employment. The qualitative data showed two themes among probationers reporting the condition to be *extremely severe* (Table 5-8). The first theme was that they felt being on probation would make it hard to obtain employment. A sixty

year-old, White, female, property offender highlighted the theme by saying “if you were looking at a perspective job, I believe that your prospective employer would not hire you, would not hire you if she know, if she knew that you were on probation.” A thirty-two year-old, White, female, public order offender’s statement also shared this sentiment. Her statement was:

if you’re on probation it’s hard enough to get a job as it is right now, but they look, they don’t definitely look too kindly on the fact that you’re, I mean I guess in some aspects charged as a criminal.

The second theme that emerged was that probationers reported the condition to be *extremely severe* because of the current economy. The statement “no job, recession” was made by a thirty-five year-old, Black, female, drug offender and was a common one statement among other probationers who identified the condition as being *extremely severe*. Being on probation and the current state of the economy were the two reasons probationers reported a condition of obtaining employment would be *extremely severe*.

Maintain employment/school enrollment. From the transcripts I extracted one theme regarding the condition of maintaining employment and/or school enrollment (Table 5-8). Those who indicated the condition to be *extremely severe* reported feeling this way because they thought being on probation might make it difficult to comply with the condition. A thirty-one year-old, Black, female, public order offender reported, “they can say, ‘oh, you’re on probation, done. You have a record.’” Statements like these were common among those probationers. Currently being on probation was the only theme noted as to why probationers reported maintaining employment would be *extremely severe*.

Allow probation officer to visit residence and allow probation officer to visit employment site. Only one theme emerged when I performed a content analysis on responses about why probationers consider their probation officers visiting their homes and/or employment sites to be *extremely severe* (Table 5-8). Probationers reported that the conditions were *extremely severe* because the conditions were intrusive. “I’m a private person and I believe it’s intrusive” was a comment made by a fifty-three year-old, White, male, public order offender and highlights this theme. A twenty-five year-old, White man, serving probation for a public order offense, also expressed this sentiment, as evident by his statement “I don’t really want them there. I mean, you know, I go see them once a month anyway I don’t understand why that’s not good enough.” Probationers considered the conditions of allowing their probation officers to visit them at their homes and/or jobs to be intrusive.

Pay monthly cost of supervision and pay court costs. The two standard financial conditions had two major themes regarding why probationers identified them as being *extremely severe* (Table 5-8). The first theme that emerged was that the consequences of not completing the conditions were too severe. A twenty-one year-old, White, female public order offender stated:

Some people aren’t able to pay the court costs or the probation fee or things like that, so I think that’s kind of steep how they do that and sometimes if you don’t pay it, they lock you back up.

Her sentiment was expressed by other interviewees.

Probationers also reported that conditions were *extremely severe* because the actual cost was too high. “Too much money to be paying” was a statement made by a forty-four year-old, Black, female, drug offender. Statements like “it’s a lot of money” (twenty-seven year-old, White, male, public order offender) and “it’s costly, just can’t

afford it, you know it's just a lot of money" (forty-five year-old, White, male, public order offender) were common feelings. The financial conditions were thought of as being *extremely severe* because the consequences for violating them being too great, as well as the amount required was too high.

Another theme that was exclusive to the cost of supervision was that the probationers felt having to pay for their own supervision was *extremely severe*. A forty-five year-old, White man, serving a sentence for a public order offense, reported "I feel that you know why am I paying somebody to watch over me. Why do I have to pay them?" Other probationers concurred with his opinion and therefore considered the condition to be *extremely severe*.

Summary of standard conditions

When I examined probationers' qualitative responses regarding why they identified particular conditions as being *not severe* or *extremely severe*, the majority of probationers considered a condition to be *not severe* when the condition was thought of as being reasonable, a good idea, and not difficult to adhere to or complete.

Probationers also reported standard conditions to be *not severe* if they felt they had nothing to hide. Conditions were thought of as being *extremely severe* if the condition was expensive. Additionally, probationers reported conditions as *extremely severe* if they felt the condition was not appropriate for their charges or if they thought the consequences for violating was too great.

Treatment Conditions of Probation

Not severe

Submit to random screens. As I did for standard probation conditions, I coded the transcriptions for themes pertaining to treatment conditions. The condition of

submitting to random screens had two themes emerge (Table 5-9). The first theme was that emerged was that probationers reported the condition was *not severe* because they felt they had nothing to hide. A twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender shared that “I’m clean, and I know I won’t get in trouble.” Others made similar statements or simply stated “I don’t have anything to hide,” as a forty-eight year-old, White, female, public order offender did.

The second theme that arose was that interviewees felt randomly screening for alcohol and drugs was a good idea. A forty-eight year-old, White man, who was serving a probation sentence for a public order offense, expressed that the condition could “help you stay clean.” This was also a view held by a twenty-one year-old, Black, male, public order offender, who stated the condition could “make sure you’re on track, make sure you’re doing good and, um, if you did have a problem, you need that little extra incentive to not do the drug and maybe it will fix your addiction.” Being a good idea and having nothing to hide were the two themes that emerged when I examined the responses as to why submitting to random screen was *not severe*.

Do not possess or consume alcohol and do not possess or consume illegal drugs. The major theme that was noted was that probationers did not identify the conditions to be severe because they did not drink nor do drugs (Table 5-9). During the interview, a forty-two year-old, White man, who was serving probation for a property offense, stated “I don’t drink,” which was a statement made by other probationers. “I don’t do illegal drugs” (twenty-nine year-old, White, male, violent offender) was another common statement.

In the case of not possessing or consuming illegal drugs, there was an additional theme. Probationers also identified the condition to be *not severe* because besides being a violation of probation it is also against the law. A twenty-nine year-old, White, male, public order offender and a forty-two year-old, White, female, property offender had the identical comment of “it’s against the law.” Their comment was a common response. Both conditions were considered to be *not severe* because the probationers did not typically drink and/or do drug, while the condition of not possessing and consuming drugs was also considered to be *not severe* because doing so was against the law.

Treatment programs or courses. Interviewees were asked about eight specific treatment programs or courses (i.e., alcohol treatment, drug treatment, employment programming, Milepost class, batterer’s intervention, anger management and driver’s class). Though they were asked about each program they identified as being *not severe*, two overall themes emerged from the probationers’ responses regarding the treatment programs or courses (Table 5-9). The first theme that emerged was that the probationers felt the treatment conditions, regardless of the specific program or class, was or could be helpful. For example a twenty-one year-old, White, male, public order offender stated “those classes help you to get better, like they try at least to change the person that you are to make you a better person that you won’t be in that situation again.” Another twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender expressed that the treatment programs and courses are “going to be ultimately helpful anyways, to avoid future incidents,” while a thirty year-old, White man serving probation for a violent

crime simply stated “helpful” when asked about the treatment programs and courses he identified as *not severe*.

Table 5-9. Treatment conditions of probations’ qualitative themes

Condition	Not Severe	Extremely Severe
Submit to random screens	Nothing to hide Good idea	Invasion of privacy
Do not possess or consume alcohol	Do not regularly do so Illegal	Legal
Do not possess or consume drugs	Do not regularly do so	Difficult
Participate in alcohol treatment	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult
Participate in drug treatment	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult
Participate in mental health treatment	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult
Participate in employment program	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult
Complete Milepost class	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult
Complete batterer’s intervention	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult
Complete anger management	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult
Attend driver’s course	Helpful Not difficult	Costly Difficult

The second overall theme that I noted regarding the treatment programs and courses was that probationers often identified the conditions to be *not severe* because they thought the programs and courses were simple to complete. A statement made by a twenty-two year-old, White, male, public order offender summarized this theme. His

statement was “pretty mindless, and most of the time you just show up and do very minor things and you get it done.” A twenty-two year-old, White, male, drug offender also expressed this view by stating “all you have to do is go to a little class, and that shouldn’t be that hard.” Treatment programs and classes were thought of as being *not severe* by probationers because the programs and classes were considered to be helpful and simple to complete.

Extremely severe

Submit to random screens. From the content analysis I identified one theme (Table 5-9). Probationers who identified the condition of submitting to random screens as being *extremely severe* did so because they felt the process invaded their privacy. A forty-one year-old, Black, female, public order offender shared “I think it’s an invasion of your personal privacy.” A twenty-two year-old, White, man serving a sentence for a violent offense also shared this view and stated “I feel it’s an invasion of my privacy, plain and simple.” The condition was thought of as being *extremely severe* because it was invasive was the only theme noted.

Do not possess or consume alcohol and do not possess or consume illegal drugs. I noted one theme among those who identified the condition of not possess or consuming alcohol to be *extremely severe* (Table 5-9). Probationers felt the condition was *extremely severe* because possessing and consuming alcohol was legal. During his interview a thirty-one year-old, White, public order offender said “it’s not against the law to possess or consume alcohol as long as you ain’t driving, so what rights, what right do you have to tell me what I can and can’t do that’s not illegal.” Another White, male, public order offender, who was thirty-one years old, expressed the same viewpoint and commented “it’s legal. You should be able to drink.”

For those who identified not consuming or possessing illegal drugs as being *extremely severe*, it appeared that they felt quitting drugs would be difficult. During her interview a twenty-four year-old, White woman, who was on probation for a drug offense, stated “drugs, it’s hard, ‘cause crack is hard to stay off of.” Another probationer, who was twenty-seven year-old, Black, male, property offender, candidly admitted that the condition was *extremely severe* because “I smoke. I smoke too much.” The condition of not consuming and possessing alcohol was identified as being *extremely severe* because drinking alcohol is legal, while not consuming and possessing drugs was viewed as *extremely severe* because using would be difficult.

Treatment programs or courses. As was the case with the explanations of why probationers felt the treatment programs or courses were *not severe*, two overall themes emerged regarding of the specific the treatment program or course (Table 5-9). Regardless of the program or class, the interviewees cited the condition to be *extremely severe* because of the financial cost associated with the program or course. A forty-three year-old, White, female, violent offender expressed this theme by saying “it’s expensive, and I have to put every single penny into it and I think that’s really severe.” Other probationers simply stated “it’s expensive,” as a twenty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender did.

The second overall theme noted about treatment programs and courses was that attending the actual course could be difficult to adhere to or complete. During her interview, a forty year-old, White, female, public order offender expressed that the programs and courses were “long,” which was a sentiment shared by others. A forty-eight year-old, White, female, public order offender stated “I work full time. It would

impact my job,” when asked to expand on why she felt a treatment program or course as a condition would be *extremely severe*. When examining the reasons probationers identified treatment programs and classes as being *extremely severe*, I noted that they were considered *extremely severe* because of the cost and that the programs and classes were difficult to complete.

Summary of treatment conditions

Treatment conditions were considered to be *not severe* because the conditions were viewed as being a good idea or that the probationer did not regularly engage in the activity. Additionally, the treatment programs and classes were viewed as being helpful and not difficult to complete, resulting in them being identified as being *not severe*. Probationers who identified the treatment conditions as being *extremely severe* typically did so because the conditions were difficult to adhere to or complete or because the conditions were expensive.

Punitive Conditions of Probation

Not severe

Complete community service hours in lieu of fees and complete mandatory community service hours. The two conditions that involved performing community service hours had one theme in common (Table 5-10). Probationers identified the condition as being *not severe* because it was not difficult to complete. “It’s really nothing, I mean, I don’t do nothing hard” was a statement made by a forty year-old, Black, female, property offender, which was similar to a statement made by a twenty year-old, Black, female, violent offender. She said “it’s not that hard to. It’s easy.”

For the condition of doing community service in lieu of paying fees, probationers also as express the condition was *not serve* because it was easier than having to pay.

A thirty-five year-old, Black, female, drug offender said “it’s easier to do the community service hours in lieu of fees if you don’t have that much money or much income.” This was also a thought shared by a forty-six year-old, White, female, public order offender who stated “because people who can’t afford it, it helps them” when she was asked to expand on why she felt the condition was *not severe*.

For those who identified performing mandatory community service hours as being *not severe* another theme that emerged was that individuals felt community service was a reasonable condition to require people to perform. When asked to expand on his

Table 5-10. Punitive conditions of probations’ qualitative themes

Condition	Not Severe	Extremely Severe
Community service in lieu of fees	Not difficult Easier than paying	Interferes with work
Mandatory community service	Not difficult Reasonable	Interferes with work
Complete work crew days	Not difficult	Exposure to “criminals” Hard work
Complete a jail sentence	Reasonable Vacation	Scary place Negatively impacts life
Pay restitution	Can afford it Reasonable	Expensive
No contact with victim	Not difficult Good idea	Interferes with relationships
Attend one victim impact panel	Helpful Not difficult	Emotionally difficult
Driver’s license suspended/revoked	Reasonable Not difficult	Negatively impacts life Have to rely on others
Abide with order of impoundment	Not inconvenient	Negatively impacts life
Abide by curfew	No impact	Restricts freedom Not a child

ranking, a thirty-five year-old, White, public order offender stated “I think you should have to do some things to help give back to the community.” Another male probationer, who was twenty-five years old, and a Black, property offender, shared this viewpoint and concluded that “you’re helping the community.” Performing community service in lieu of fees and performing mandatory community service was viewed as being *not severe* because it is not difficult to complete, while community service in lieu of fees was also considered to be *not severe* because performing community service is better than having to pay. Additionally, mandatory community service was seen as being a reasonable condition.

Complete work crew days. The qualitative analysis showed that individuals did not feel doing work crew days was severe because the condition was not difficult to complete (Table 5-10). A thirty-four year-old, Black man, who was serving a probation sentence for a property offense, summarized the views held by others with his statement of “it’s not a big deal or nothing, I just do it.” A twenty-two year-old, White, male, public order offender indicated that if assigned the condition he would consider the condition to be *not severe* because he “wouldn’t mind doing that.” Completing work crew days was *not severe* because the condition was not difficult to complete.

Complete a jail sentence. Among the responses regarding a jail sentences as being *not severe*, two themes emerged (Table 5-10). The first theme was that individuals saw a jail sentence as being a reasonable condition for some offenses. A thirty-five year-old, White man, who was on probation for a public order offense, stated that “if you committed a crime you should probably, you know, it fits getting jail then, I don’t see that as severe, I’d see that as kind of fitting.” A twenty-one year-old, White

woman, serving probation for a public order offense, held the same view and said “it’s just part of committing a crime, you gotta pay your debt.”

The second theme was the probationers felt serving a jail sentence would be a break from their lives; they saw a jail sentence as a vacation. “Gosh, three days and a cot, without three kids nagging on you, that would be a vacation” was a comment by a fifty year-old, White man, serving a sentence for a public order offense. A thirty-four year-old, Black, female, property offender supported this theme when she said:

I just feel like that’s just time off [laughing]. It’s just, you know, it’s just somewhere I can just keep my mind, you know, just be in my own little space for a little time that I’m incarcerated you know.

Probationers who identified the completing a jail sentence as *not severe* did so because they felt the jail sentence was reasonable and/or because a jail sentence would be a break from their daily lives.

Pay restitution. The only financially punitive condition had two themes emerge (Table 5-10). While coding, I discovered that probationers reported finding the condition to be *not severe* because they had the means to afford it. “I have money,” which was a statement made by a forty-one year-old, White, male, public order offender and whose comment was echoed by several interviewees. Other probationers identified the condition to be *not severe* because they felt the condition was a reasonable condition. A twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender expressed this viewpoint in her comment “it’s your responsibility if you damage something in some way by being irresponsible,” as did a twenty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender by saying “if I would have hurt somebody I would have been responsible for injury.” Paying restitution was reported as being *not severe* because probationers viewed the condition as being affordable and/or reasonable.

No contact with victim. During the content analysis two themes emerged regarding the condition of not having contact with the victim (Table 5-10). The first theme was that probationers felt the condition was *not severe* because it was not difficult to accomplish. Some stated that they did not want to contact their victim because they did not like the person, while others did not want to because they did not know their victim. For example, a fifty-eight year-old, Black, female, property offender stated “I don’t go around her, I don’t want to be around her,” while another female offender, who was thirty-two years old and a White, public order offender, stated “I’ve never ever seen the person.”

The second theme that emerged was that probationers felt the condition of no contact with victim was a good idea. A fifty-year old-year, Black, female, public order offender expressed it the best with her comment of:

I feel like that if they are a victim, then it’s best that you stay away from them. Um, because you guys aren’t getting along, and but, it’s best if it’s in your interest to stay away from them and keep from getting in more trouble.

The two themes emerged when I examined the interviewees’ responses regarding why they perceived the condition of no contact with victim as being *not severe*. The themes were that the condition was easy to adhere to and that the condition was a good idea.

Attend one victim impact panel. The same themes that emerged for the treatment programs and classes appeared for the victim impact panel. Specifically, individuals expressed that they felt the condition was *not severe* because the condition was helpful and not difficult to accomplish (Table 5-10). A sixty year-old, White, male, public order offender commented:

I’ve done the victim impact panel, uh, it was very enlightening. Um it, ah, provide a great deal of information that was, um, there to help you make a

decision about whether or not you would ever try to do something like that again.

Besides identifying the condition as a *not severe* because it is a learning opportunity, probationers also indicated the condition was simple. A twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender expressed this view by saying “it took just one hour and watch a video.”

Driver’s license suspended/revoked. The condition of having one’s driver’s license suspended and/or revoked was identified as being *extremely severe* by more interviewees than any other condition. However, there were some that identified the condition as being *not severe*, and they felt so because they felt it was a reasonable condition (Table 5-10). A forty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender demonstrated this theme in her comment “if you’re doing something silly while you’re driving, then you shouldn’t be driving.”

Another theme that merged was that complying with the condition was not difficult and therefore the condition was *not severe*. Some made statements similar to a twenty-two year-old, White, male, public order offender’s comment of “I can get rides from friends and there’s other forms of transportations.” Another probationer, who was twenty-five year-old, Black, male, public order offender was similar; he said “I would take a bus. It’s Gainesville, yeah, you can pretty much take the bus anywhere.” Having one’s driver’s license suspended/revoked was perceived as *not severe* because the condition was a reasonable one and because it was not difficult to adhere to or complete.

Abide by order of impoundment. One of the themes that emerged from the qualitative data regarding impoundment was that probationers did not find the condition

to be an inconvenience (Table 5-10). Several stated that their cars were totaled and therefore the condition was *not severe*. For example, a thirty-one year-old, Black man, who was serving probation for a public order offense, stated “in my case, uh, the vehicle was totaled.” The condition was also not an inconvenience because they had alternative transportation. A forty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender said “I can take the bus, I can walk to work,” which was similar to a twenty-seven year-old, White, male, public order offender’s comment of “I just, I took the bus so it didn’t really affect me at the time.” The condition of having their vehicle impounded was viewed by some probationers as being *not severe* because it was not an inconvenience for them.

Abide by curfew. The final punitive condition, abide by curfew, only had one theme, which was that the condition did not really impact their lives (Table 5-10). Many probationers identified the condition was *not severe* because they were typically home so a curfew would not affect their lives. “I come home from work and stay home with my kids. I don’t go nowhere else” was a statement made by a thirty-four year-old, White, male, public order offender. A twenty-four year-old, Black, female, violent offender stated “I be in by a certain time. I be in the house by seven” when asked to elaborate why she felt the condition was not severe, while a forty-one year-old, Black, male, public offender stated “I don’t really go out anymore.” Individuals reported the condition to be *not severe* because a curfew would not affect them.

Extremely severe

Complete community service hours in lieu of fees and complete mandatory community service hours. The conditions involving community service hours only had one theme that emerged for those who thought it was *extremely severe* (Table 5-

10). These probationers felt that performing the community service hours interfered with their jobs. Individuals reported having full-time jobs, and indicated that trying to schedule the hours around their job was difficult. A forty-three year-old, White, male, violent offender's comment of "it, um, interferes with my work" summarized the theme.

Complete work crew days. The condition of completing work crew days was identified as being *extremely severe* because the condition was seen as something that should be reserved for more serious offenders than themselves (Table 5-10). "Work crew days are for pretty extreme criminal act," commented a thirty-two year-old, White, female, public order offender and others agreed with her. Interviewees referred to those assigned to work crew as "hardened criminals" (sixty year-old, White, female, property offender) and "super-duper criminals" (twenty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender).

In addition to probationers feeling the condition was *extremely severe* because it would expose them to offenders they consider more deviant than themselves, some probationers felt that actual work that would be required made the condition *extremely severe*. A sixty-one year-old, White, male, public order offender simply said "I don't wanna work in the heat." When asked to elaborate on her ranking the condition as *extremely severe*, a twenty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender said:

They make you work all day, and they put you in random sites and you gotta get up like 7 o'clock in the morning, be there all day, no pay, no nothing, so it's like you're working for free basically.

The two reasons given by probationers, who identified completing work crew days as being *extremely severe*, was that the condition was reserved to more serious offenders than themselves and that they considered the work to be difficult.

Complete a jail sentence. While analyzing the qualitative data, I noted two major reasons why individuals reported completing a jail sentence as *extremely severe* (Table 5-10). The first theme was that they saw a jail sentence as *extremely severe* because they saw jail as being a place they did not want to go. A twenty year-old, Black, female, violent offender responded “it’s a scary, scary thing to be in. Jail is not a good place to be” when asked why a jail sentence would be *extremely severe*. A thirty-two year-old, White, female public order offender’s comment of “the one single night that I had to spend in jail was horrible so I couldn’t imagine” also supports this theme.

The other theme I noted was that probationers felt that serving a jail sentence would negatively affect their lives therefore the condition was *extremely severe*. When asked to expand on why she felt the condition was *extremely severe*, a twenty-nine year-old, Black, female, public order offender stated “I would have lost my job, um, my house, my everything.” Some focused on how the sentence would affect their jobs. For example, a forty-one year-old, Black, male, public order offender said “it would cause me to lose my job.” Other probationers expressed feeling the condition was *extremely severe* because it would affect their home-life significantly. A thirty year-old, White, female, public order offender’s comment of “I need to be out to take care of my daughter” summarized this theme. Those who identified completing as a jail sentence as being *extremely severe* did so because they viewed jail as a place they did not want to be and/or because going to jail would negatively impact their lives.

Pay restitution. The only reason given as to why paying restitution was *extremely severe* was that the amount was too much (Table 5-10). “It’s really expensive” was a statement made by a sixty-two year-old, White, male, public order

offender and was a view shared by those who identified the condition to be *extremely severe*. The word “expensive” was used by a twenty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender when asked to explain why she felt the condition of restitution was *extremely severe* and was a common response by others.

No contact with victim. While two themes emerged as reasons why interviewees they identified the condition as *not severe*, only one theme emerged among the *extremely severe* comments (Table 5-10). Individuals who felt the condition was *extremely severe* felt so because of their relationship with the victim. Often they had a close relationship with the victim and shared children with the victims. “That’ll be extremely severe, too, ‘cause she’s the mother of my child, we have a job together, so we have to have a relationship together” was a statement made by a twenty-three year-old, Black, male, violent offender. A fifty-five year-old, White, male, property offender reported a similar sentiment and stated:

I think no contact with your victim or the kid that was involved is a real severe problem because for one, they can’t contact you. We had Children and Families involved, and she can’t contact me, I can’t contact her, and that’s a tough thing, especially for the kid, that’s why I think it’s severe, for the children.

Due to their close relationship with the victim some probationers identified the condition of no contact with the victim as being *extremely severe*.

Attend one victim impact panel. Those who indicated the condition to be *extremely severe* reported feeling so because they felt the class could be emotionally difficult (Table 5-10). A forty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender’s statement of “it was very, uh, emotional, emotional, uh when I went there” is a good example of this sentiment. The class being seen as emotionally difficult was the only

theme I noted when I examined the responses given by probationers who considered attending a victim impact panel to be *extremely severe*.

Driver's license suspended/revoked. I identified two common trends in the probationers' responses to why losing a driver's license was *extremely severe* (Table 5-10). The first theme that emerged from the qualitative data was that probationers reported the condition was *extremely severe* because it negatively affected other aspects of their lives, including probation. A sixty year-old, White, male, property offender stated "that would be a strong impediment to being employed or even surviving in this society" when he was asked why he felt the condition was *extremely severe*. A twenty-nine year-old, Black, female, public order offender responded "transportation is very, um, necessary in my life, between, um, transporting my kids to and from school, going to, em, from work and just daily living tasks." A thirty-one year-old, Black, female, public order offender's comment also demonstrated this theme. Her response was "how are you supposed to get to probation once a month, how are you supposed to get to drug treatment, how are you supposed to get to community service, you know?"

Probationers also expressed feeling that having their driver's license suspended or revoked was *extremely severe* because they have to rely on others. A thirty-two year-old, White, female, public order offender's comment of "you have to depend on others all the time" was a common response. Another White, female, public order offender, who was forty-seven years old, also expressed this theme by saying "it's just a pain in my butt [laughing]. I have to ask everybody for a ride." Having to rely on others, as well as that it negatively impacts their lives, were the reasons given by those who identified having their driver's license suspended or revoked would be *extremely severe*.

Abide by order of impoundment. From the content analysis, I only identified one theme with regard to why impoundment was *extremely severe* (Table 5-10). Probationers appeared to report that the condition of abiding by an order of impoundment is *extremely severe* because it negatively affects their lives. When asked to elaborate on why she felt the condition would be *extremely severe*, the forty-eight year-old, White, public order offender stated “it’s harder to get around and go to work when you don’t have a vehicle.” A fifty-three year-old, White, male public order offender’s comment of “it would impede my ability to like, go around and find work, that sort of thing” is another example of this theme.

Abide by curfew. I identified two themes while examining the interviewees’ responses (Table 5-10). Probationers appeared to feel that the condition of a curfew was *extremely severe* because it greatly restricted their freedom. “It’s like a loss of freedom, so I guess it’s like a restriction” was a comment made by a twenty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender. Her statement highlighted the theme, as did a twenty-three year-old, White female, public order offender’s comment of “I have stuff to do after seven.”

The other theme that emerged was that individuals identified a curfew would be *extremely severe* because the condition made them feel like children. A White woman, who was serving a probation sentence for a public order offense, stated “I’m not a child. I’m a forty-seven years old.” Another public order offender, who was a fifty-three year-old, White man, stated “I’m not a child.” The sentiments that the condition made them feel like children and that it restricts their freedom were the reasons given by those individuals who identified the condition to be *extremely severe*.

Summary of punitive conditions

I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data gathered during the interviews regarding the responses about the punitive conditions. Some of the common themes among the punitive conditions were that individuals reported the condition to be *not severe* because the condition was reasonable or not difficult to accomplish. The conditions were identified as being *extremely severe* if the condition negatively impacted the probationers' lives and if the condition was difficult in terms of being expensive.

Chapter Summary

This chapter answered the question “do the conditions of probation fall on a continuum when it comes to severity? If so, which conditions are viewed as being most severe?” The conditions appeared to fall on a continuum with most of the items comprising the “severity standard scale” and the “severity treatment scale” being perceived as less severe than “severity punitive scale’s” items. The condition of notifying the probation officer of changes in residence had more probationers indicating it to be *not severe* than any other condition, while having one’s driver’s license suspended and/revoked had the most probationers identifying it to be *extremely severe* (Table 8-1 lists the conditions on a continuum based on *extremely severe* responses percentages). There were few significant predictors of perceived conditions’ severity. *Age*, *race* and *new law violation* were significant predictors for multiple severity scales, with those who were younger, non-White and had a new law violation being more likely to report the scales to be severe.

In order to have a better understanding of the probationers’ severity rankings, I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data and identified common themes.

Though some themes may have varied by probation condition category, it appears that probationers often identified a condition to be *not severe* if the condition was perceived to be easy, helpful, and/or reasonable. On the other hand, conditions were often identified as being *extremely severe* if the condition was thought of as difficult, expensive and/or if the condition negatively impacted their lives. Both quantitative and qualitative data suggested that most probationers did not find the conditions of their probation to be severe.

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 2B— DIFFICULTY OF CONDITIONS

In addition to examining how severe probationers perceive their probation conditions to be, I also examined how *difficult* probationers perceived their conditions of probation to be. It is conceivable that individuals might consider a probation condition to be severe relative to their charges but consider the actual condition of probation not difficult to comply with or complete. It is also possible that probationers may find a condition to not be severe in comparison to their charges but consider the condition to be very difficult to adhere to or complete. I wanted to understand the relationship between perceived severity and difficulty so that I can answer the study's second research question, "what are probationers' perceptions of their conditions of probation?" The first sub-research question regarding severity was examined in the previous chapter. This chapter answers the second sub-research question, "do probationers' views of the severity of a condition impact their perceived ability to complete a particular probation condition?" First, I analyze the quantitative data by examining the participants' survey responses, correlations results, and regression model estimates. Second, I examine the results from the content analysis I performed on the qualitative data.

Quantitative Analysis

Percentages and Frequencies: Difficulty of Probation Conditions

Based on Petersilia and Deschenes (1994a) study that had current inmates rate the perceived difficulty of complying with thirteen conditions, I asked current probationers to rate the perceived difficulty of thirty-two different probation conditions. The participants were asked to indicate the perceived likelihood that they will be able to

complete or follow the probation conditions and given the response options: *not difficult* (1), *relatively easy* (2), *about 50/50* (3), *somewhat difficult* (4) and *very difficult* (5) (Methods chapter for more details). Once all the data were collected, I ran exploratory factor analysis and created seven difficulty scales based on the analysis. Additionally, I created three difficulty scales and included one variable based on previous literature (Dependent Variables section for more details).

Mean scores

The “mandatory attendance scale” was composed of all the treatment programs and courses and the punitive condition of attending a victim impact panel. The mean scores for the “mandatory attendance scale” and its nine scale items equated to a response of *relatively easy*¹ (Table 6-1). The “monetary concerns scale” was composed of conditions that require payments (i.e., monthly cost of supervision, court costs and restitution) and two conditions that may hinder a person’s ability to complete the financial conditions by affecting his or her ability to work (i.e., work crew day and jail sentence). With the exception of one scale item, the scale and items indicated a response of the conditions being *about 50/50* in terms of difficulty. One scale item, complete a jail sentence, had the mean score of 3.5 and corresponded to a response of *somewhat difficult*. None of the two previously discussed scale or scale items’ mean scores corresponded with a *not difficult* or *very difficult* response.

Thus far the difficulty scales based on factor analysis have had little variance between the scale and scale items’ mean scores, however the “accountability scale” and “drug-employment scale” means scores varied greatly (Table 6-1). The

¹ The mean scores were rounded up if the value was 0.5 or higher.

“accountability scale’s” and two scale items’ mean score values corresponded with the response of *relatively easy*, while one item, answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer, corresponded to *not difficult*. The condition of complete mandatory community service hours mean score corresponded with *about 50/50* perceived level of difficulty. The scale and its items’ mean scores equated to three different answer responses, none of which was greater than the response of *about 50/50*. The “drug-employment scale” was composed of three conditions; the scale and two conditions’ mean score equated to *relatively easy*, while one condition equated to *not difficult*.

As of yet, only one condition’s mean score indicated a response to *somewhat difficult* and none have equated to *very difficult* (Table 6-1). The “notification scale” and its two components all had the mean score of 1.2 and equated to *not difficult*. None of the three “restriction scale” items corresponded to the response of *not difficult* and instead one item corresponded to a response of *relatively easy* and the scale and one item corresponded to *about 50/50*. Having one’s driver’s license suspended or revoked had a mean score of 3.8 and equated to an answer of *somewhat difficult*. The final scale created using factor analysis, “difficulty-visits scale” scores corresponded to the answer response of *relatively easy*.

Of the seven difficulty scales created based on factor analysis, only one scale’s mean score equated to a response of *not difficult* (Table 6-1). Four scales equated to a response of *relatively easy*. Two of the scales, the “monetary concerns scale” and the “restriction scale,” had mean scores that equated to an answer of response of *about 50/50* in terms of difficulty. None of the scales’ mean score equated to *somewhat difficult* or *very difficult*.

Table 6-1. Percentages for difficulty scales based on factor analysis

Scales based on factor analysis	N	Not difficult	Relatively easy	About 50/50	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	Mean
Mandatory Attendance Scale							1.9
Item 1: Participate in alcohol treatment	155	45.8	21.9	17.4	8.4	6.5	2.1
Item 2: Participate in drug treatment	133	49.6	16.5	14.3	14.3	5.3	2.1
Item 3: Participate in mental health treatment	129	50.4	20.2	10.9	13.2	5.4	2.0
Item 4: Participate in employment program	124	50.8	28.2	9.7	7.3	4.0	1.9
Item 5: Complete Milepost class	97	53.6	15.5	12.4	14.4	4.1	2.0
Item 6: Complete Batterer's Intervention	119	53.8	12.6	13.4	10.9	9.2	1.8
Item 7: Complete anger management	127	53.5	16.5	12.6	12.6	4.7	1.8
Item 8: Attend driver's course	151	47.0	20.5	11.9	13.2	7.3	2.1
Item 9: Attend one victim impact panel	148	57.4	21.6	8.8	6.8	5.4	1.8
Monetary Concerns Scale							3.1
Item 1: Pay monthly cost of supervision	199	26.1	13.6	20.6	22.1	17.6	2.9
Item 2: Pay court costs	195	20.5	12.3	16.9	26.2	24.1	3.2
Item 3: Complete work crew days	137	27.7	19.0	15.3	18.2	19.7	2.8
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	145	22.8	6.9	8.3	20.0	42.1	3.5
Item 5: Pay restitution	132	25.8	15.9	15.2	22.7	20.5	3.0
Accountability Scale							1.9
Item 1: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	201	83.6	11.9	3.0	1.0	0.5	1.2
Item 2: Submit to random screens	176	68.2	18.2	9.1	2.8	1.7	1.5
Item 3: Complete mandatory CS hours	179	36.3	19.6	19.0	11.7	13.4	2.8
Item 4: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	166	39.2	21.1	14.5	12.0	13.3	2.4
Drug-Employment Scale							1.8
Item 1: Try to obtain employment	184	44.6	16.3	16.8	10.3	12.0	2.3
Item 2: Maintain employment/enrollment	183	61.7	20.2	7.1	6.6	4.4	1.7
Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	181	74.6	16.6	4.4	2.2	2.2	1.4

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult= 5

Table 6-1. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	N	Not difficult	Relatively easy	About 50/50	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	Mean
Notification Scale							
Item 1: Notify PO of changes in residence	201	84.6	11.9	2.0	1.0	0.5	1.2
Item 2: Notify PO of changes in Employment	195	85.6	11.3	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.2
Restriction Scale							
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	197	73.1	12.2	8.1	4.6	2.0	1.5
Item 2: Driver's license suspended/revoked	162	17.3	6.8	6.8	21.6	47.5	3.8
Item 3: Abide with order of impoundment	147	31.3	14.3	8.8	16.3	29.3	3.0
Difficulty-Visits Scale							
Item 1: Allow PO to visit residence	192	67.7	15.6	6.8	6.8	3.1	1.6
Item 2: Allow PO to visit employment site	183	67.7	12.6	7.1	8.2	10.9	2.0

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

In addition to having the seven difficulty scales based on a factor analysis, I created three scales using the same conditions based of their literature-based classification (Clarke, 1979; Petersilia, 1997a). The first literature-based scale, “difficulty standard scale” was composed of eleven items (Table 6-1). Three items, answering truthfully and notifying the probation officer of changes in residence and/or employment’ scores were *not difficult*, while the scale and six standard items’ mean scores equated to the answer of *relatively easy*. The remaining two standard items were the two financial items and had mean scores that corresponded to an *about 50/50* level of difficulty. None of the standard conditions’ mean score equated to a response of *somewhat difficult* or *very difficult*.

The “difficulty treatment scale” had less variance in the mean scores than the “difficulty standard scale” (Table 6-1). The scale and ten of the eleven scale items’ mean scores ranged from 1.5 to 2.1 and scores indicated an answer of *relatively easy*. The remaining treatment condition, do not possess or consume drugs, had a mean score of 1.4 and corresponded to an answer of *not difficult*. None of the treatment conditions’ mean scores indicated a response of *about 50/50*, *somewhat difficult* or *very difficult*.

None of the “difficulty punitive scale’s” items’ mean scores corresponded to a response of *not difficult* (Table 6-1). Instead three the conditions comprising the scales had mean score corresponding to an answer of *relatively easy*, while five other punitive conditions and the scale’s mean scores range from 2.7 to 3.0 and corresponded with the answer of *about 50/50*. The final two punitive conditions, completing a jail sentence and having one’s driver’s license suspended or revoked had mean scores

corresponding to *somewhat difficult*. They were the only two conditions whose score indicated that response.

The *overall difficulty variable* was included since it was used in the Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) research which this study is built upon. The mean score for the variable was 2.9 and corresponded to an *about 50/50* level of difficulty (Table 6-1).

Summary of the mean scores. With the expectation of two conditions, the mean scores corresponded with the responses *about 50/50*, *relatively easy* and *not difficult*, with most corresponding to *relatively easy*. Only two conditions' mean scores corresponded to the answer of *somewhat difficult* and none of the conditions' score indicated the response of *very difficult*.

Factor analysis-based scales

Mandatory attendance scale. The percentage of interviewees' responses per scales' items were next examined (Table 6-1). The "mandatory attendance scale's" items, which were mainly conditions requiring treatment programs and courses attendance, had between 46 to 57% of the interviewees reporting the condition to be *not difficult*. For all nine items, fewer than 9% of the sample indicated the condition to be *very difficult*. For most of the conditions included in the scale, half of those interviewed considered the condition to be *not difficult* and a small percentage reported them to be *very difficult*.

Monetary concerns scale. In general, respondents felt the monetary conditions were more difficult than the previous set of items (Table 6-1). For five conditions less than 28% of the interviewees reported to condition to be *not difficult*. For the condition of paying court costs only 21% (N= 40, 20.5%) of the sample indicated the condition to be *not difficult*, which is fewer than the 23% (N= 33, 22.8%) who indicated the condition

of complete a jail sentence to be *not difficult*. In terms of identifying the conditions as being *very difficult*, four of the “monetary concerns scale’s” items had less than 24% of sample reporting the condition to be *very difficult* to comply with or complete. The remaining condition, complete a jail sentence, had over 40% (N= 61, 42.1%) of the sample reporting it to be *very difficult*. For this scale, completing a jail sentence had the greatest percentage of individuals reporting the condition to be *very difficult* (Table 8-2 lists the conditions on a continuum based on *very difficult* responses percentages).

Accountability scale. There was more variance among the conditions comprising this scale in comparison to the previous scales on severity (Table 6-1). One of the conditions, answering truthfully to inquiries by probation officer, had 84% (N= 168, 83.6%) of those interviewed perceiving the condition to be not difficult. Sixty-eight percent (N= 120, 68.2%) of them perceived the condition of submitting to random screens to be not difficult. While those two conditions were indicated to be not difficult by the majority of the sample, the remaining two conditions comprising the scale had considerably fewer individuals reporting the community service-related conditions to be not difficult. Similarly, fewer than 2% of the sample reported the first two conditions to be very difficult to comply or adhere to, while the two community service conditions had 13% report the conditions to be very difficult. The two standard conditions comprising the scale were not considered as difficult to complete as the two punitive conditions included in the scale.

Drug-employment scale. Though the “drug-employment scale’s” items’ percentages varied greatly across categories, the percentages did not vary as greatly as the previous scale’s percentages (Table 6-1). Two-thirds (N= 135, 74.6%) of the

sample considered the condition of not possessing or consuming drug to be *not difficult* to follow and 2% (N= 4, 2.2%) thought it to be *very difficult*. As far as the two employment conditions, 62% (N= 113, 61.7%) of the individuals reported to maintaining employment would be *not difficult* to do, while 45% (N= 82, 44.6%) of them considered obtaining employment to be *not difficult*. Twelve percent (N= 22, 12.0%) identified obtaining employment to be *very difficult* while only 4% (N= 8, 4.4%) identified maintaining employment to be. It appears that individuals considered finding a job to be more difficult than maintaining the job. When it comes to the conditions included in this scale, more participants considered the conditions to be *not difficult* than *very difficult*.

Notification scale. The two conditions requiring the probationers to notify their probation officer of any changes in residency and/or employment had the highest percentage of individuals reporting the conditions to be *not difficult* in comparison to other conditions (Table 6-1). Both conditions had over 85% of the interviewees reporting the conditions to be *not difficult* and less than 1% of the sample indicating the condition to be *very difficult*. For both conditions only one person indicated the conditions to be *very difficult*.

Restriction scale. The “restriction scale” was composed of one standard condition and two punitive conditions. The standard condition had slightly more than 70% (N= 144, 73.1%) of the probationers indicating that committing no new law violation would be *not difficult*, while only 2% (N=4, 2.0%) of them reported the condition to be *very difficult* (Table 6-1). The standard condition was perceived as being less difficult than the two punitive conditions. Roughly an equal amount of the interviewees considered the condition of impounding their car to be *not difficult* as considered the

condition to be *very difficult*. The condition of having a driver's license suspended or revoked was the condition that had the least amount of interviewees indicating the condition to be *not difficult* and the most indicating it to be *very difficult* out of the thirty-two conditions. Only 17% (N=28, 17.3%) of the sample indicated that complying with their driver's license being suspended or revoked would be *not difficult*, while 48% (N=77, 47.5%) perceived it to be *very difficult* to adhere to or complete. The condition of having their driver's license suspended or revoked was considered to be the most difficult condition.

Difficulty-visit scale. The final scale created based on factor analysis was the "difficulty-visit scale." The two conditions had similar estimates in terms of individuals reporting the condition to be *not difficult* (Table 6-1). Nearly of 70% of the sample considered the conditions to be *not difficult*. The condition of probation officer visiting the probationer's home had 3% (N= 6, 3.1%) of the sample indicating that complying with the condition would be *very difficult*, while 11% (N= 20, 10.9%) of them indicated the probation officer visiting the probationer's employment site was *very difficult*. The majority of the probationers felt the two conditions were *not difficult*, but more considered the probationer officer visiting an employment site to be more difficult than the probation officer vising a residence.

Overall, the majority of factor analysis-based scales' items were identified as being *not difficult* to adhere to or complete (Table 8-2 lists the conditions on a continuum based on *very difficult* responses percentages).

Literature-based scales

Difficulty standard scale. I also examined the percentages when the conditions were placed in the literature-based scales. Over 60% of the interviewees indicated

eight of the eleven standard conditions were *not difficult* to comply with (Table 6-2). With the exception of one condition, fewer than 4% of the sample identified the conditions to be *very difficult*. Trying to obtain employment was a condition was considered to be *not difficult* by 45% (N= 82, 44.6%) of the respondents, while 12% (N=22, 12.0%) of probationers considered the condition to be *very difficult*. The two standard financial conditions had fewer than 26% of the sample indicating that it was *not difficult* to comply with or complete. Twenty-four percent (N=47, 24.1%) of the probationers identified paying the court costs to be *very difficult*, while 18% (N=35, 17.6%) of them identified paying the monthly cost of supervision as being *very difficult*. Of the standard conditions, the financial ones had the least amount of interviewees reporting them to be *not difficult* to comply or complete. Three of the standard conditions were the probation conditions that had the most interviewees reporting the condition to be *not difficult*. Answering truthfully to inquiries by probation officer, notifying the probation officer of changes in residence and/or in employment were the conditions with the highest percentages of interviewees identifying them as being *not difficult*.

Difficulty treatment scale. In the case of the treatment conditions, all eleven conditions had at least 46% of the sample identifying them as being *not difficult* (Table 6-2). Nine percent or fewer indicated the treatment conditions to be *very difficult*. The treatment condition with the greatest percentage of probationers reporting it to be *not difficult* was the condition of not possessing or consuming drugs. Overall, the treatment conditions were identified by more of the sample as being *not difficult* than being very difficult with which to comply.

Table 6-2. Percentage for difficulty scales and variable based on the literature

Scales based on literature	N	Not difficult	Relatively easy	About 50/50	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	Mean
Difficulty Standard Scale							1.9
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	197	73.1	12.2	8.1	4.6	2.0	1.5
Item 2: Report to probation once a month	201	67.7	15.9	7.5	7.5	1.5	1.6
Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	201	83.6	11.9	3.0	1.0	0.5	1.2
Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence	201	84.6	11.9	2.0	1.0	0.5	1.2
Item 5: Notify PO of changes in employment	195	85.6	11.3	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.2
Item 6: Try to obtain employment	184	44.6	16.3	16.8	10.3	12.0	2.3
Item 7: Maintain employment/enrollment	183	61.7	20.2	7.1	6.6	4.4	1.7
Item 8: Allow PO to visit residence	192	67.7	15.6	6.8	6.8	3.1	1.6
Item 9: Allow PO to visit employment site	183	67.7	12.6	7.1	8.2	10.9	2.0
Item 10: Pay monthly cost of supervision	199	26.1	13.6	20.6	22.1	17.6	2.9
Item 11: Pay court costs	195	20.5	12.3	16.9	26.2	24.1	3.2
Difficulty Treatment Scale							1.9
Item 1: Submit to random screens	176	68.2	18.2	9.1	2.8	1.7	1.5
Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol	183	57.9	19.1	13.7	5.5	3.8	1.8
Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	181	74.6	16.6	4.4	2.2	2.2	1.4
Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment	155	45.8	21.9	17.4	8.4	6.5	2.1
Item 5: Participate in drug treatment	133	49.6	16.5	14.3	14.3	5.3	2.1
Item 6: Participate in mental health treatment	129	50.4	20.2	10.9	13.2	5.4	2.0
Item 7: Participate in employment program	124	50.8	28.2	9.7	7.3	4.0	1.9
Item 8: Complete Milepost class	97	53.6	15.5	12.4	14.4	4.1	2.0
Item 9: Complete Batterer's Intervention	119	53.8	12.6	13.4	10.9	9.2	2.1
Item 10: Complete anger management	127	53.5	16.5	12.6	12.6	4.7	2.0
Item 11: Attend driver's course	151	47.0	20.5	11.9	13.2	7.3	2.1

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

Table 6-2. Continued

Scales based on literature	N	Not difficult	Relatively easy	About 50/50	Somewhat difficult	Very difficulty	Mean
Difficulty Punitive Scale							2.7
Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours	179	36.3	19.6	19.0	11.7	13.4	2.5
Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	166	39.2	21.1	14.5	12.0	13.3	2.4
Item 3: Complete work crew days	137	27.7	19.0	15.3	18.2	19.7	2.8
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	145	22.8	6.9	8.3	20.0	42.1	3.5
Item 5: Pay restitution	132	25.8	15.9	15.2	22.7	20.5	3.0
Item 6: No contact with victim	124	55.6	18.5	8.9	8.1	8.9	2.0
Item 7: Attend one victim impact panel	148	57.4	21.6	8.8	6.8	5.4	1.8
Item 8: Driver's license suspended/revoked	162	17.3	6.8	6.8	21.6	47.5	3.8
Item 9: Abide with order of impoundment	147	31.3	14.3	8.8	16.3	29.3	3.0
Item 10: Abide by curfew	119	40.3	10.9	10.1	16.8	21.8	2.7
Overall Difficulty Variable	200	17.0	21.0	27.0	22.5	12.5	2.9

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

Difficulty punitive scale. The ten punitive probation conditions included in the study had fewer of the interviewees identifying them to be *not difficult* to comply with in comparison to the standard and treatment conditions. The two conditions associated with victims (i.e., no contact with victim and attend victim impact panel) had similar estimates with slightly more than 55% of those interviewed indicating the conditions to be *not difficult*. They were the punitive conditions with the greatest percentage of individuals indicating them to be *not difficult* and the smallest percentage of individuals indicating them to be *very difficult*. The conditions involving community service and the curfew condition had similar estimates except most interviewees reported abiding by a curfew would be *very difficult*. Roughly 30% (N=46, 31.3%) of the sample felt impounding one's car would be *not difficult* to comply with but roughly 30% (N= 43, 29.3%) also felt the condition was *very difficult*.

Three of the punitive conditions had between 20 and 30% of the probationers reporting the condition to be *not difficult* (Table 6-2). However, roughly 40% (N= 61, 42.1%) of them considered the completing a jail sentence to be *very difficult*, while only about 20% thought the other two conditions were *very difficult*. The final punitive condition, driver's license suspended or revoked, had the least amount of probationers reporting the condition to be *not difficult* and the most probationers reporting the condition to be *very difficult*.

Overall difficulty variable. The question, "what do you think about the difficulty of your sentence of probation" was used in Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) study and was also used here. This question allowed me to examine how probationers feel about their overall sentence. The majority of interviewees reported their probation

sentence to be *about 50/50* or less in terms of difficulty. Twenty-three percent (N=45, 22.5%) of the sample reported probation to be *somewhat difficult* and only 13% (N=25, 12.5%) of them reported probation to be *very difficult*.

Summary of frequencies and percentages. With the exception of the two standard financial conditions, the items that compose the “difficulty standard scale” and the “difficulty treatment scale” were perceived to be less difficult than the scale items comprising the “difficulty punitive scale.” The condition with the most probationers identifying it as *not difficult* was notifying the probation officer of changes in employment with approximately 86% (N= 167, 85.6%) of the sample indicating the condition to be *not difficult*. The condition that was most often reported as being the *very difficult* was having one’s driver’s license suspended and/revoked, with 48% (N= 77, 47.5%) of the interviewees identifying the condition as being *very difficult* for them. When asked to evaluate their probation sentence in its entirety, the majority of probationers identified probation to be *not difficult, relatively easy* or *about 50/50*. Only slightly more than a third identified probation to be *somewhat difficult* or *very difficult* (Table 8-2 lists the conditions on a continuum based on very difficult responses percentages).

The percentage of participants indicating the conditions to be not severe were similar to the percentage of participants indicating the conditions to be not difficult. It appears that when individuals consider a condition to be not severe they may be factoring in how difficult the probation condition would be to follow or complete into their evaluation. The majority of the probation conditions were considered to be both not severe and not difficult.

Correlations and Regressions: Difficulty of Probation Conditions

Once the frequencies were examined, I ran correlations with the difficulty dependent variables and the twenty-three independent variables (Tables 6-3, 6-4 and 6-5 and see Appendix K for correlations by scale item). The twenty-three independent variables used were the same personal characteristics, previous criminal history and current offense and probation sentence variables used in the severity analysis. Following the correlations, I ran ordinary least squares linear (OLS) regression regressions for any variables correlated at the bivariate level (Appendix L for regression tables that included all the independent variables).

Factor analysis-based scales

I first ran correlations for the seven difficulty scales created based on factor analysis.

Mandatory attendance scale¹. Only two independent variables were significant at the bivariate level (Tables 6-4 and 6-5). The variables *prior probation* and *severity* were significant and therefore an OLS regression model was estimated with the two independent variables² and the dependent scale, “mandatory attendance scale.” Both of the variables were significant (*prior probation*: $b = 0.43$, $p = 0.040$; *severity*: $b = 0.68$, $p = 0.000$) (Table 6-6). Individuals who had served a prior probation sentence were more likely to find the conditions that required them to attend a program or course difficult

¹ I ran regression models for each of the scales with all twenty-three independent variable. *Severity* was a significant predictor for the “mandatory attendance scale” ($b = 0.95$, $p = 0.000$) (Appendix L). As was the case with *severity* being significant when a reduced model was run, the model estimates indicated that individuals who considered their probation conditions to be severe were more likely to report the conditions that compose the scale to be difficult.

² Two collinearity diagnostic factors were used to assess multicollinearity. None of the variables had a tolerance value below 0.60 or had a variance inflation factor (VIF) above 2.0, which indicated multicollinearity was not a problem in any of the models.

than individuals who had not served a prior probation sentence. Additionally, those who ranked their probation conditions to be severe were more likely to consider their probation to be difficult than those who ranked their probation conditions to be less severe. Having prior probation experience and considering probation to be more severe increased the likelihood of the probationers reporting the “mandatory attendance scale” items to be difficult.

Monetary concerns scale³. The personal characteristic, *gender*, was significant at the bivariate level and continued to be significant when the OLS model was estimated ($b = -0.44$, $p = 0.041$) (Table 6-3 and 6-6). The negative relationship between *gender* and the scale items suggested that women were more likely to report the conditions to be difficult than men. Women appeared to find paying their cost of supervision, court costs and restitution, as well as completing work crew hours and a jail sentence to be more difficult than their male probation counterparts.

Accountability scale⁴. Two personal characteristics, *race* and *employment status* and one current offense and probation sentence variable, *severity* was significantly correlated with the “accountability scale” (Table 6-3 and Table 6-5). Next, I ran OLS regression with the “accountability scale” as the dependent variable and *race*,

³ When a model was run with all the independent variables and the “monetary concern scale” as the dependent variable, *severity* ($b = 0.77$, $p = 0.005$) and current *violent offense* ($b = 0.38$, $p = 0.043$) were significant predictors of the scale (Appendix L). Those who identified the conditions of probation as being severe and those who were on probation for a violent offense were more likely to report the conditions comprising the scale as being difficult to comply with than those who identified the conditions of probation as being not severe and those who were on probation for an offense other than a violent one.

⁴ Four independent variables were identified as significant predictors when an OLS model was estimated with all the independent variables and the dependent variable, “accountability scale” (Appendix L). The personal characteristics, *age* ($b = 0.03$, $p = 0.011$), *race* ($b = 0.83$, $p = 0.006$), and *gender* ($b = 0.63$, $p = 0.012$) were significant predictors, as was the variable *severity* ($b = 0.57$, $p = 0.002$). Probationers who were older, White, male and identified probation conditions as being severe were more likely to identify the scale items as being difficult.

Table 6-3. Correlations of difficulty scales and personal characteristics variables

	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Scales based on factor analysis									
Mandatory Attendance Scale	0.13	0.12	0.04	0.02	-0.03	-0.12	-0.60	0.15	-0.01
Monetary Concerns Scale	-0.02	0.01	-0.19*	0.06	-0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.09	-0.05
Accountability Scale	0.04	0.19*	0.06	-0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.09	0.37**	0.13
Drug-Employment Scale	-0.08	-0.11	0.12	-0.01	-0.12	-0.03	-0.09	-0.24**	0.05
Notification Scale	-0.10	-0.04	0.13	0.08	0.03	-0.14*	-0.04	-0.04	0.11
Restriction Scale	-0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.13	-0.08	0.05	-0.09	0.05	-0.02
Difficulty-Visits Scale	-0.02	0.00	0.19*	0.10	0.12	-0.12	0.12	0.09	0.03
Scales based on literature									
Difficulty Standard Scale	-0.05	-0.06	0.10	0.21**	0.13	-0.07	-0.02	-0.06	0.07
Difficulty Treatment Scale	0.15	0.12	0.09	-0.00	-0.05	-0.12	-0.04	0.16	0.05
Difficulty Punitive Scale	-0.01	0.17	0.00	0.07	-0.14	-0.06	0.02	0.06	-0.00
Overall Difficulty Variable	-0.01	0.01	-0.05	0.27**	0.08	-0.15*	-0.04	-0.00	-0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 6-4. Correlations of difficulty scales/variable and previous criminal history variables

	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Scales based on factor analysis							
Mandatory Attendance Scale	-0.05	-0.03	-0.01	0.21*	0.06	-0.06	0.00
Monetary Concerns Scale	-0.07	0.08	0.01	0.07	-0.03	0.01	0.08
Accountability Scale	-0.09	-0.04	-0.08	0.04	-0.09	-0.11	-0.04
Drug-Employment Scale	0.03	0.19*	0.15*	-0.02	0.12	-0.01	0.00
Notification Scale	-0.10	-0.03	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.08	-0.07
Restriction Scale	0.03	-0.03	0.01	-0.00	-0.06	-0.09	-0.10
Difficulty-Visits Scale	-0.05	0.06	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06
Scales based on literature							
Difficulty Standard Scale	-0.09	0.06	-0.01	-0.03	-0.06	-0.06	0.11
Difficulty Treatment Scale	-0.06	-0.03	-0.00	0.18	0.06	-0.07	-0.02
Difficulty Punitive Scale	-0.03	0.04	0.08	0.13	-0.07	-0.09	-0.04
Overall Difficulty Variable	-0.10	-0.06	-0.07	-0.05	-0.10	-0.05	-0.07

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 6-5. Correlations of difficulty scales/variable and current offense and probation sentence variables

	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation	Severity
Scales based on factor analysis								
Mandatory Attendance Scale	-0.08	0.09	-0.04	0.15	0.06	-0.07	-0.10	0.42**
Monetary Concerns Scale	-0.13	-0.08	-0.05	0.06	-0.03	-0.02	0.04	0.35
Accountability Scale	-0.15	-0.07	0.02	0.13	-0.09	-0.02	-0.01	0.22*
Drug-Employment Scale	0.10	0.13	0.06	-0.02	0.12	0.04	0.10	0.23*
Notification Scale	0.08	0.09	-0.02	-0.05	0.00	-0.03	0.05	0.30**
Restriction Scale	0.12	0.17*	0.14	0.11	-0.06	0.02	-0.05	0.28*
Difficulty-Visits Scale	-0.07	-0.03	-0.00	0.10	-0.04	0.07	0.02	0.16
Scales based on literature								
Difficulty Standard Scale	-0.01	0.05	0.00	0.05	-0.06	0.02	0.07	0.36**
Difficulty Treatment Scale	-0.11	0.09	-0.04	0.13	0.06	-0.06	-0.09	0.41**
Difficulty Punitive Scale	-0.03	0.07	0.03	0.20	-0.07	-0.01	-0.03	0.42**
Overall Difficulty Variable	0.02	0.04	-0.05	0.09	-0.10	-0.03	0.01	0.16

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

employment status and *severity* as the independent variables (Table 6-6). *Race* ($b = -0.53$, $p = 0.007$) and *severity* ($b = 0.41$, $p = 0.014$) were significant predictors of the “accountability scale”, while *employment status* was not a predictor of the scale. Non-White probationers were more likely to report truthfully answering inquiries by their probation officers, submitting to random screens and completing community service hours as being more difficult than probationers who identified themselves as White. Additionally, those who reported that probation conditions were more severe were also more likely to consider the conditions to be difficult to adhere or complete. *Race* and perceptions of *severity* predicted how difficult individuals reported the “accountability scale” items.

Table 6-6. Predicting conditions of probation’s difficulty- factor analysis-based scales

		Scale		
		Mandatory Attendance Scale		
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta	
Prior probation	0.43*	0.21	0.22	
Severity	0.68***	0.18	0.40	
Constant	0.41	0.35		
R-square	0.23			
Adjusted R-square	0.20			
Standard error of the estimate	0.88			
Degrees of freedom	2			
F-value	10.29***			
N	73			
		Monetary Concerns Scale		
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta	
Gender	-0.44*	0.21	-0.19	
Constant	3.33	0.17		
R-square	0.04			
Adjusted R-square	0.03			
Standard error of the estimate	1.12			
Degrees of freedom	1			
F-value	4.26*			
N	119			

Table 6-6. Continued

Scale			
Accountability Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Race	0.53**	0.19	0.31
Employment status	0.14	0.19	0.08
Severity	0.41*	0.16	0.28
Constant	0.76	0.35	
R-square	0.16		
Adjusted R-square	0.13		
Standard error of the estimate	0.80		
Degrees of freedom	3		
F-value	4.72**		
N	78		
Drug-Employment Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Employment status	-0.29	0.21	-0.16
Seriousness history	0.03	0.01	0.04
Prior violent offense	-0.27	0.10	-0.05
Severity	0.40*	0.18	0.26
Constant	1.25	0.37	
R-square	0.08		
Adjusted R-square	0.03		
Standard error of the estimate	0.89		
Degrees of freedom	4		
F-value	1.58		
N	78		
Notification Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Parental status	-0.18	0.11	-0.17
Severity	0.28	0.09	0.32
Constant	0.78	0.19	
R-square	0.12		
Adjusted R-square	0.10		
Standard error of the estimate	0.48		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	5.26**		
N	78		

Table 6-6. Continued

Variable	b	Scale	
		Restriction Scale Standard Error	Beta
Violent offense	0.29	0.26	0.12
Severity	0.46*	0.19	0.27
Constant	1.85	0.38	
R-square	0.09		
Adjusted R-square	0.07		
Standard error of the estimate	0.97		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	3.82*		
N	78		
		Difficulty-Visits Scale	
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Gender	0.45*	0.17	0.19
Constant	1.52	0.14	
R-square	0.04		
Adjusted R-square	0.03		
Standard error of the estimate	1.13		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	6.59*		
N	181		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Drug-employment scale¹. Four of the twenty-three independent variables were correlated with the drug-employment scale at the bivariate level; however only one continued to be significant once the model was estimated (Tables 6-3, 6-4, 6-5 and 6-6). *Employment status*, *prior criminal history seriousness*, *prior violation of probation* and *severity* were significantly correlated to the dependent variable. Only *severity* remained

¹ When I ran OLS regression with all the independent variables and “drug-employment scale” as the dependent variable, four variables were identified as significant predictors of the scale (Appendix L). *Employment status* (b= 0.42, p= 0.000), *violation of probation* on current probation (b= 0.63, p= 0.035), *new law violation* (b= -0.93, p= 0.022) and *severity* (b= 0.52, p= 0.006). Individuals who were employed, had not violated their probation, did not receive a new law violation and identified probation conditions as being severe were more likely to report the “drug-employment scale” items to be difficult to comply with or to complete.

significant ($b = 0.40$, $p = 0.026$). Individuals who perceived their probation conditions to be severe were more likely to also consider the probation conditions difficult. If they considered their probation sentence to be severe they were more likely to consider obtaining and maintaining employment and not possessing and/or consuming illegal drugs more difficult than probationers who conditioned their overall probation sentence to be *not severe*.

Notification scale². Two independent variables were correlated with the “notification scale” at the bivariate level. *Parental status* and *severity* were significantly correlated (Table 6-3 and Table 6-5). A model predicting the scale with *parental status* and *severity* as predictors was run and neither variable was significant (Table 6-6). None of the variables predicated the perceived difficulty of notifying the probation officers of any changes in living situations and/or employment.

Restriction scale. The two independent variables correlated at the bivariate level with the “restriction scale” were current *violent offense* and *severity* (Table 6-5). Next, I ran a regression model with the “restriction scale” as the dependent variable and *violent offense* and *severity* as the independent variables (Table 6-6). Current *violent offense* was not significant but *severity* ($b = 0.46$, $p = 0.018$) was a significant predictor of the scale. As probationers reported perceived severity of probation conditions increases so does the likelihood of them reporting the conditions of not committing any new law violation, having their driver’s license suspend or revoked, and abiding by an order of

² New law violations, technical violations and severity were predictors of the “notification scale” when the full model was run (Appendix L). Those who did not have a *new law violation* ($b = -0.63$, $p = 0.014$) while those who received a *technical violation* ($b = 0.43$, $p = 0.030$) were more likely to report the “notification scale” items to be difficult to follow. Additionally, probationers who reported the probation conditions to be severe (*severity*: $b = 0.29$, $p = 0.012$) were more likely to report the two conditions that required them to notify their probation officer of changes in residency and/or employment.

impoundment as being difficult. Those who indicated their probation were severe were more likely to indicate the scale items were difficult.

Difficulty-visits scale³. The “difficulty-visits scale” only had one variable correlated at the bivariate level; *gender* was significantly correlated (Tables 6-3, 6-4 and 6-5). Using OLS regression, I determined that *gender* was a significant predictor ($b=0.45$, $p=0.011$) (Table 6-6). Women were more likely to report the probation conditions that compose the scale to be difficult than the men who participated. Women reported that probationers visiting their homes and/or employment sites to be more difficult to comply or adhere with than men.

Literature-based scales

In addition to running correlations and regressions with the factor analysis-based scales, I ran correlations with the difficult scales created based on prior literature and the personal characteristics, previous criminal history and current offense and probation sentence independent variables. OLS regression was run with the variables that were significantly correlated at the bivariate level.

Difficulty standard scale⁴. All the conditions that were classified as a standard condition of probation created the first literature-based scale, “difficulty standard scale.”

³ *Race* ($b=-0.92$, $p=0.006$), *sample* ($b=0.55$, $p=0.031$) and *charge level reduction* ($b=0.62$, $p=0.038$) were significant predictors for the “difficulty-visits scale” when the total models were estimated (Appendix L). Non-White probationers, probationers conveniently sampled and those who had their original charges reduced were more likely to report their probation officers visiting their homes and/or employment sites as being difficult to adhere to than White probationers, probationers randomly sampled and those whose charges were not reduced.

⁴ When I estimated a model with the independent variables and the scale that was composed of the eleven standard conditions, four variables were significant predictors: *type of offense* ($b=0.21$, $p=0.014$), *plea bargain* ($b=-0.32$, $p=0.032$), *new law violation* ($b=0.49$, $p=0.018$) and *severity* ($b=0.29$, $p=0.000$) (Appendix L). The less severe the offense type, those that were sentenced to probation not via a plea bargain, those who do not have a new law violation and those who reported the conditions to be severe were more likely to report the standard conditions to be difficult to adhere to or complete.

Two independent variables were significant at the bivariate level; *ethnicity* and *severity* (Tables 6-3 and 6-5). A model predicting the “difficulty standard scale” with *ethnicity* and *severity* as predictors was run (Table 6-7). Only *severity* remained significant once OLS regressions were estimated ($b = 0.31$, $p = 0.001$). Those who reported conditions of probation to be severe were more likely to consider the conditions to also be difficult than those who reported the conditions of probation be *not severe*. As probationers reported conditions as being severe, the likelihood of them reporting standard conditions of probation to be difficult to comply or adhere to increased.

Difficulty treatment scale⁵. When it came to examining the eleven treatment probation conditions and the twenty-three independent variables, *severity* was the only variable that was significant at the bivariate level (Table 5-3). I next ran OLS regression and *severity* remained a significant predictor of “difficulty treatment scale” (Table 5-7) ($b = 0.61$, $p = 0.000$). Probationers who identified probation conditions to be severe were more likely to also identify the probation conditions as being difficult to adhere to or complete. If an individual reported his or her probation conditions to be severe, he or she was more likely to find the treatment conditions to be difficult.

Difficulty punitive scale⁶. One independent variable, *severity*, was significantly correlated with the “difficulty punitive scale” at the bivariate level (Table 6-5). I ran OLS

⁵ Two independent variables, *employment status* ($b = 0.22$, $p = 0.016$) and *severity* ($b = 0.86$, $p = 0.000$), were significant predictors for the “difficulty treatment scale.” Participants who are employed as well as participants who reported the conditions of probation to be severe were more likely to identify the eleven treatment conditions to be difficult to complete and/or adhere to than probationers who were not employed or reported the probation conditions to be not severe.

⁶ When I ran OLS regression for the total model, *employment status* ($b = 0.29$, $p = 0.021$) and *seriousness* ($b = 0.13$, $p = 0.012$) were significant predictors of the “difficulty punitive scale” (Appendix L). Individuals who were employed and those with more serious criminal histories were more likely to report the ten punitive conditions that composed the “difficulty punitive scale” to be difficult than those who were not employed and those who had less seriousness criminal histories.

regression with the scale as the dependent variable and *severity* as the only independent variable (Table 6-7). *Severity* ($b = 0.64, p = 0.000$) was a significant predictor of the scale composed of the ten punitive conditions. Those who indicated probation conditions to be severe were more likely to report the punitive conditions to be difficult than those who reported the probation conditions to be *not severe*. The ten punitive conditions included in the study were more likely to be perceived as difficult by those who also consider probation conditions to be severe than by those who considered probation conditions to be *not severe*.

Table 6-7. Predicting conditions of probation's difficulty- literature-based scales

Scale			
	Difficulty	Standard Scale	
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Ethnicity	0.24	0.10	0.05
Severity	0.31**	0.09	.36
Constant	1.22	0.18	
R-square	0.13		
Adjusted R-square	0.11		
Standard error of the estimate	0.47		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	5.67**		
N	78		
Difficulty Treatment Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Severity	0.61***	0.16	0.41
Constant	0.68	0.31	
R-square	0.17		
Adjusted R-square	0.16		
Standard error of the estimate	0.81		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	14.57***		
N	73		

Table 6-7. Continued

Variable	Scale		
	b	Standard Error	Beta
Severity	0.64***	0.16	0.42
Constant	1.44	0.34	
R-square	0.18		
Adjusted R-square	0.17		
Standard error of the estimate	0.82		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	15.34***		
N	72		
Variable	Overall Difficulty Variable		
	b	Standard Error	Beta
Ethnicity	1.31***	0.35	0.26
Parental status	-0.32	0.18	-0.13
Constant	3.04	0.14	
R-square	0.09		
Adjusted R-square	0.08		
Standard error of the estimate	1.22		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	9.57***		
N	198		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Overall difficulty variable⁷. The overall difficult variable was the final dependent variable included in the study and was based on a question used in Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) study (Methods chapter for more detail). *Ethnicity* and *parental status* were the only two independent variables significantly correlated with this dependent variable (Table 6-3). Once OLS-regression were run only *ethnicity* remained significant (b= 1.31, p=0.000) (Table 6-7). Non-Hispanics were less likely to report their

⁷ None of the twenty-three independent variables were significant predictors for the *overall difficulty* variable when the total model was estimated (Appendix L).

probation to be difficult overall in comparison to Hispanics. Hispanics were significantly more likely than non-Hispanics to perceive their probation to be overall more difficult.

Summary of correlations and regressions. When I ran correlations at the bivariate level there were very few variables that were significantly correlated. I next ran OLS regressions with the variables significant at the bivariate level. None of the difficulty scales had more than four variables correlated. Out of the eleven difficulty scales and variables, *severity* was a significant predictor in seven of the scales, with those who indicated their probation conditions as being severe being more likely to report their probation conditions as being difficult to follow or complete. *Gender* was the only other variable that was a significant predictor for multiple severity scales; women were more likely to report particular probation conditions as being difficult to comply with than men. The independent variables *age*, *marital status*, *years of education*, *sample*, *previous history*, *prior violent offense*, *prior violation*, *jail history*, *prior sentence history*, *current offense type*, *plea bargain*, *charge level reduction*, *violation of probation*, *new law violation* and *technical violation* were not significant at the bivariate level for any of the difficulty scales. There were few variables that were significant in predicting probationers' perceptions of the difficulty of probation conditions, and the probationers' perception of the condition's severity was the variable most likely to predict the probationers' perception of the condition difficulty.

Qualitative Analysis

In order to understand why the participants rated the conditions as they did, participants were asked to expand on their answers. They were asked for each condition that they reported as being *not difficult* and for each condition that they reported as being *very difficult*. The participants' open-ended responses were digitally-

recorded. Of the 202 interviews conducted, 159 interviews (78.7%) were recorded. In the cases where the interview was not recorded, the interviewer took detailed notes, which often included direct quotes (Data Collection section for more details). After the recorded interviews were transcribed and interviewer's note from the interviews not recorded were written up, I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data. I examined and coded the data for themes that may help answer Research Question 2b, which focused on probation conditions' difficulty.

Standard Conditions of Probation

Not difficult

No new law violation. When I performed a content analysis on the responses given by the probationers who identified the standard condition of new law violation as being *not difficult* to follow, only one theme emerged (Table 6-8). Participants identified the condition as being *not difficult* because they did not typically commit criminal offenses and therefore thought it would not be difficult for them to not commit criminal offenses while they were on probation. "I don't break the law (chuckle) but yeah, I don't do bad stuff" was a comment made by a twenty-six year-old, White, female, violent offender. A forty year-old, White, female, public order offender made a similar comment. She stated "I'm pretty good. I'm not a criminal." Another White, female, public order offender, who was forty-eight years old, shared "I follow the law." In sum, probationers perceived the condition *not difficult* to follow because they did not typically break laws.

Report to the probation office once a month. There were two themes expressed by probationers who identified having to report to the probation office once a month as being *not difficult* (Table 6-8). The first theme was that individuals did not

perceive the condition to be difficult because it only required them to report one day a month. A thirty-five year-old, Black man, who was serving a probation sentence for a drug offense, said “just easy to find time for one day” when asked why he considered the condition to be *not difficult*. This was a sentiment shared by a thirty-two year-old, White, male public order offender, as evidenced by his comment “it’s only once a month for only fifteen minutes.” A White man, who was twenty-two years old and serving probation for a violent offense, stated “it’s just once a month. It’s very easy to go do.” A twenty year-old Hispanic, White, male, violent offender said “it’s only once a month, not every week like GPS.” “It’s only once a month and it’s what, like twenty minutes maximum, in the morning so, and she lets me to pick time and date that I can, that like, I’m able to come so, it’s pretty easy” was a comment made by a twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender.

The second theme that emerged when I performed the content analysis was that probationers considered reporting to the probation agency once a month was *not difficult* because their schedules were open. A twenty-two year-old, White, female public order offender’s comment of “my schedule is pretty free for the most part, for the most part, so it’s not hard to report” highlighted this theme. The theme was also seen in a statement made by a Black man, who was twenty-three years old and serving probation for a public order offense. His comment was “I got the time on my hands and her schedule kind of works with mine a lot so um, it’s easy for us to just find the time and I just make the time.” The themes that emerged from the probationers’ comments on why reporting once a month is *not difficult* to do were that it is only once a month and that their schedules were open.

Table 6-8. Standard conditions of probations' qualitative themes

Condition	Not Difficult	Very Difficult
Commit no new law violation	Do not regularly do so	Crooked police More susceptible
Report once a month	Only one day Open schedule	Transportation problems Scheduling hassle
Answer truthfully	Nothing to hide Honest	Refused to expand
Notify if changes in residence	Simple process	Refused to expand
Notify if changes in employment	Simple process	Refused to expand
Try to obtain employment	Have a job	Economy Criminal record
Maintain employment/school	Good worker	Criminal record
Allow PO to visit residence	Nothing to hide	Hard to explain to others
Allow PO to visit employment	Nothing to hide Legitimate employment	Hard to explain to others Negatively affect job
Pay monthly cost of supervision	Financial situation	Financial situation
Pay court costs	Financial situation	Financial situation

Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer. The two themes extracted from the qualitative data regarding why answering truthfully to inquiries by probation officers was not a difficult condition to follow were the same two themes extracted from the statements made by probationers who identified the condition to be *not severe* (Table 6-8). Probationers considered the condition to not be difficult because they did not have anything to lie about or because they considered themselves to be always honest. The statement made by a thirty-two year-old, Black, male drug offender's comment "there's nothing to lie about" highlights the first theme, as does the forty-five

year-old, White, male, public order offender's comment of "got nothing to hide." "I have nothing to hide" was stated by a twenty-three year-old, White man, serving probation for a public order offense and was similar to a twenty-eight year-old, White, female public order offender's statement of "I've got nothing to hide."

In addition to identifying the condition as being *not difficult* because they do not have anything to lie or hide, probationers also considered the condition to be *not difficult* because they consider themselves to be honest. "I'm an honest person" was stated by a Hispanic, Black man, who was fifty-seven years old and serving probation for a violent offense. The theme was also supported by the comment of a twenty-five year-old, Black woman serving probation for a violent offense. Her comment was "not hard because I'm an honest person and if you lie it make it worse so it's not difficult to me." "I'm truthful" was stated by a fifty-three year-old, White, female public order offender and was similar to a forty-five year-old, White, male, public order offender's comment "I am a truthful and honest person." The two themes of having nothing to hide and being honest were the only themes identified from the qualitative data addressing the condition of being truthfully to the probation officer as being *not difficult*.

Notifying probation officer of changes in residence and notifying probation officer of changes in employment. The content analysis that I performed identified one major theme when it came to the two conditions requiring probationers to notify their probationer officers of any changes in living situations and/or employment (Table 6-8). Probationers who identified the two conditions as being *not difficult* reported the condition was *not difficult* because the process of notifying the probationer officers of changes was a simple process. "You just fill out a form" was stated by a thirty-seven

year-old, Black man, serving probation for a violent offense, when he was asked to expand on why the condition was *not difficult* to adhere to or complete. A thirty-five year-old, White man, who was serving probation for a public order offense, made a similar comment; his comment was “it would just be a paperwork thing.” Others even shared that the paperwork could be completed via telephone. “All it is, is a phone call” was shared by a forty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender, while a thirty-five year-old, White, male, violent offender said “pretty easy, only a phone call away.” The participants who identified the two conditions requiring them to notify their probation officers about changes in their lives reported the condition to be *not difficult* to comply with because the process of notifying the probation officers is a simple process requiring only a form to be completed or a phone call to be made.

Try to obtain employment. When I examined the participants’ responses about why they considered the condition of trying to obtain employment as being *not difficult*, I only identified one theme (Table 6-8). The theme that emerged was that individuals considered the condition to be *not difficult* because they already had a job. “I have a job” was a statement made by a forty-five year-old, Black, Male, public order offender and a forty-eight year-old, White, female, public order offender. A thirty-four year-old, White, male, public order offender made a similar comment; he stated “I have a job now, and I have a job set for when I move.” The sentiment was also shared by a twenty-two year-old, Black man, serving probation for a drug offense, as evident in his comment “I have a job currently, and I plan on keeping it.” It appears that individuals who consider the condition of trying to obtain employment to not be difficult to comply with because the condition does not really apply to them since they already have a job.

Maintain employment/school enrollment. There was one major theme that I was able to extract from the responses regarding the condition, maintaining employment/school enrollment (Table 6-8). Probationers indicated that the condition was *not difficult* to comply with because they considered themselves to be good workers and therefore maintaining employment was *not difficult*. A twenty-nine year-old, Black, male, violent offender's comment of "I'm a good worker on the job and I, I report in on time and I do my work" highlighted this theme as did twenty-three year-old Black, male violent offender's comment of "I'm a good worker." A White woman, who is twenty-seven years old and serving a probation sentence for a public order offense, stated "I'm a persistent worker. I work." The only theme that emerged was that individuals felt that the condition was *not difficult* because they were good workers. None of the probationers made any statements why they considered maintaining school enrollment was *not difficult*.

Allow probation officer to visit residence and allow probation officer to visit employment site. When I performed a content analysis of the qualitative data pertaining to why probationers reported the conditions to be *not difficult*, the conditions of allowing probationer officers to visit their residences and/or employment sites shared one major theme (Table 6-8). Participants reported that the conditions were *not difficult* to comply with because they did not have anything to hide from their probation officers. "I don't have anything to hide from him" was a statement made by a thirty-four year-old, White, male, public order offender and a sentiment shared by a forty-one year-old, Black, female, public order offender, who commented "I've got nothing to hide." The statement "I have nothing to hide" was a statement made by both a twenty-three year-

old, White man, serving a probation sentence for public order offense, and a forty-one year-old, White, male, violent offender.

When it came to the probation officers visiting employment sites, an additional theme emerged. Participants reported that the condition was *not difficult* to adhere to because they had legitimate employment. “They can feel free to let them come over because there’s nothing illegal going on, so they can come check it out whenever they want” was said by a thirty-eight year-old, White, male public order offender when he was asked to expand on why he considered the condition to be *not difficult*. The comment “there is nothing there that she would see that would get me in trouble” was made by a fifty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender and highlighted the theme. The conditions that allowed probation officers to visit the probationers’ homes and/or work sites were considered to be *not difficult* because the probationers had nothing to hide. In the case of work site visits, probationers reported that since their employment was legitimate it was *not difficult* for their probation officers to visit.

Pay monthly cost of supervision and pay court costs. The two standard conditions that require probationers to pay had one major theme in common (Table 6-8). When asked to expand on why they considered the conditions to be *not difficult*, probationers reported that they had the money to pay so it was not hard for them to comply with the condition. “I got money to pay it” was a statement made by a forty-five year-old, White man, serving probation for a drug offense. A fifty-three year-old, White, male, public order offender held similar sentiments and is evident in his comment “I have the finances that I can do that.” A twenty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender commented “I make a decent amount.” Probationers who identified paying the

monthly cost of supervision and paying court costs as being *not difficult* appeared to feel so because they were in a financial situation that afforded them the ability to pay.

Very difficult

No new law violation. Four participants identified the condition of committing no new law violation as being *very difficult* (Table 6-8). The two probationers who chose to expand on why they felt the condition was *very difficult* had two different responses. A thirty-five year-old, Black, male, drug offender stated that he felt the condition was *very difficult* to comply with because “more police than citizens” and reported feeling that the police were “crooked.” He felt complying would be difficult because he felt the police would try to find reasons to violate him. A twenty-one year-old, White woman, who was serving probation for a public order offense, felt that being on probation increased the likelihood of individuals committing a new law violation. She stated “it’s hard because you’re always more susceptible to getting in trouble. It’s like a monkey on your back.” The individuals who report the condition to be *very difficult* felt that the police would try to set them up and violate them or that being on probation increased the susceptibility of them getting in trouble and violating.

Report to the probation office once a month. Once again a limited number of probationers identified the standard condition to be *very difficult* (Table 6-8). Three probationers indicated that reporting to the probation office once a month as being *very difficult*. One drug offender, who was a twenty-two year-old, Black woman, felt the condition could be *very difficult* because “you may have car trouble or miss the bus.” Another woman probationer, who was a forty-five year-old, White, property offender, stated the condition was *very difficult* because “it takes time off of my work. I have to rearrange my schedule and I have to make sure I have the money when I come see

him.” The limited number of probationers, who identified reporting to probation as being *very difficult*, felt so because too many issues could arise that could prevent a person from being able to report or felt so because reporting was a hassle in terms of taking off work and/or rescheduling their schedule.

Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer. Only one person reported that answering truthfully to inquiries by her probation officer was *very difficult* to comply with or to complete. The forty-five year-old, White woman, who was serving probation for a property offense, declined to indicate why the condition was *very difficult*.

Notifying probation officer of changes in residence and notifying probation officer of changes in employment. Only one person identified the condition of notifying his probation officer of changes in his residence as being *very difficult*. The same person identified notifying his probation officer of changes in employment would be *very difficult*. However, the fifty-three year-old, White, violent offender did not want to expand on why he identified the conditions to be *very difficult* to adhere to or complete.

Try to obtain employment. When I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data regarding why probationers considered the condition of trying to obtain employment would be *very difficult* to comply with, two themes emerged (Table 6-8). The first theme was that individuals considered the condition to *very difficult* to comply with because of the current state of the economy. In other words, jobs were difficult to come by. “You’ve seen the economy; you can hardly get a job anywhere. I’ve been trying for a year and a half to get a job. I’m lucky to have one part-time job” was a

statement made by a twenty-eight year-old, White man, serving a probation sentence for public order offense, and highlights this theme.

The second theme that was extracted from the data was that probationers felt that their criminal background could be a hindrance and therefore made trying to obtain employment *very difficult* to comply with or complete. A twenty-seven year-old, Black man, who was on probation for a property offense, stated “my background, you know some people look at your background and your record and stuff like that and they judge you for what they see.” A forty-five year-old, White, male, public order offender shared this sentiment as evident by his statement “my background, my criminal background...this is a big key role. It’s hurting me for the get go. I can’t even get a job at McDonald’s flipping burgers because of my record.” Individuals who considered the condition of obtaining employment to be *very difficult* felt so because their criminal record would prevent them from accomplishing the condition. Additionally, others felt that the economy would make complying *very difficult*.

Maintain employment/school enrollment. I extracted one theme from the probationers’ responses about why maintaining employment/school enrollment would be *very difficult* (Table 6-8). Probationers reported that they felt the condition would be *very difficult* to comply with because employers may fire them once the employers found out about the employee being on probation. A Black man, who was thirty-one years old and serving probation for a public order offense, stated “they’re gonna say ‘oh, well I got somebody else that wants this job and don’t have a record.’ Once you have a record in the medical field that’s it.” Probationers felt that their record and being on probation

would make it difficult to maintain employment; none of the probationers shared why maintaining school enrollment would be *very difficult*.

Allow probation officer to visit residence and allow probation officer to visit employment site. I identified two themes when I performed the content analysis on the qualitative data that address why probationers considered probationer officers visit probationers' homes and employment site to be *very difficult* (Table 6-8). One theme that emerged was that probationers felt the conditions were *very difficult* because the probation officer's presence was hard to explain to others (e.g., family, neighbors, bosses, coworkers). A comment made by a thirty-one year-old, Black, female, public order offense expressed this theme; her comment was:

if my children or someone else's children did not know what was going on say they were children did not understand and they came to the home while the children were there then they have to know what's going on.

Another public order offender, who was a thirty-two year-old, White woman, shared this sentiment as evident in her comment "I think it would be very harsh; you don't want all your coworkers to know the situation that you're in."

The second theme that emerged when I was examining the reasons why probationers consider the condition of the probation officers visiting employment sites to be *very difficult* was that individuals felt that the visit might negatively impact their employment. A sixty year-old, White, female, property offender stated "I would think that would impact the employee's performance evaluations permanently" when she was asked to expand on why she felt the condition was *very difficult*. A twenty-three year-old, White man, who was serving probation for a public order offense, also expressed this sentiment. He said:

My probation is my business and, um, its already being on probation has already wrecked a lot of or a large part of my life so therefore when I finally have a job the last thing that anyone wants to see is a probation officer coming on site. Then you will probably end up losing your job as well, not anyone is going to trust you, and it's going to bring down your self-esteem, and you're not... you're going to feel embarrassed, and you're not going to want to go to work, and from that point you're not going to have any money and you're not going to be able to pay anything because they want to show their face.

Probationers felt the condition of probation officers visiting employment sites was *very difficult* because it could potentially affect probationers' jobs. Additionally, probationers felt that probation officers visiting probationers' homes and employment sites would be hard to explain to others which made the conditions *very difficult* to comply with or complete.

Pay monthly cost of supervision and pay court costs. One theme emerged during the content analysis pertaining to why probationers considered paying the monthly cost of supervision and/or court costs to be *very difficult*. Individuals who identified the conditions to be *very difficult* to comply with felt so because of their current financial situation.

It's very difficult just because of the money situation. You get thrown out of the house and you're out trying to find a new place to live; all your money has been gone. It's hard to pay all this, yeah, very hard

was a comment made by a fifty-five year-old, White, female, property offender. A forty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender shared the same sentiment as evident in her comment "right now I'm not working, and-right now, I'm dealing with personal issues, trying to straighten all those out, so right now financially I have no finances. I'm dependent on other people to financially support me." "It takes away from the bills that I owe and my house rent and light bill and food" was a statement made by a forty-five year-old, White woman, who was serving a probation sentence for a property

offense, and also supported the theme. Probationers expressed that their financial situation is the reason why they considered complying with the conditions to be *very difficult*.

Summary of standard conditions

I examined the qualitative responses given by the participants as to why they rated a standard condition as being *not difficult* or *very difficult* for themes. Though the theme may have varied based on the specific conditions those who identified the conditions as being *not difficult* typically felt so because the process for adhering to or completing the condition was simple. They also reported that some conditions were *not difficult* because they had nothing to hide and the financial means to complete the conditions. Those who reported the conditions to be *very difficult* to adhere or complete did so because completing the conditions was hard to explain to others or they did not have the money to afford the conditions. Other reasons given were specific to the conditions, though for some of the conditions the probationers refused to expand on their rating of some of the conditions.

Treatment Conditions of Probation

Not difficult

Submit to random screens. Among the individuals who considered submitting to random breathalyzers and urinalysis to be a condition that was *not difficult* to comply with one theme emerged (Table 6-9). Individuals considered submitting to the random screens to be *not difficult* because the actual screening procedure did not require a lot of effort on the part of the probationers. A thirty-seven year-old, Black, male, violent offender said “it’s not like it takes a lot of time, just pee in a cup” when asked to expand on why he considered the condition to be *not difficult*, while a twenty-three year-old,

White, female, public order offender said “it’s not hard to pee in a cup.” The theme was also highlighted in a forty-five year-old, White, female, public order offender’s comment “all you have to do is come in and give a urination or whatever it is and give a swab or whatever they try to give you.” In terms of the breathalyzer, a forty-five year-old, White, male, public order offender shared “It’s simple. Uh, I blow into a tube or whatever they want me to do and it’s done.” Individuals identified the process for submitting to a random screen to be simple and therefore the condition was *not difficult*.

Table 6-9. Treatment conditions of probations’ qualitative themes

Condition	Not Difficult	Very Difficult
Submit to random screens	Simple process	Enjoy drinking/using
Do not possess or consume alcohol	Do not regularly do so	Enjoy drinking
Do not possess or consume drugs	Do not regularly do so	Enjoy using
Participate in alcohol treatment	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes
Participate in drug treatment	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes
Participate in mental health treatment	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes
Participate in employment program	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes
Complete Milepost class	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes
Complete batterer’s intervention	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes
Complete anger management	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes
Attend driver’s course	Flexible Just sit there	Costly Negatively interferes

Do not possess or consume alcohol and do not possess or consume illegal drugs. I extracted one theme when I examined the qualitative data regarding why probationers considered not possessing or consuming alcohol and/or drugs to be easy. Participants felt the conditions were *not difficult* to adhere to because they did not consume or possess alcohol and/or drugs on a regular basis. A twenty-five year-old, Black, male, property offender stated “I don’t drink or do alcohol or drugs” when he was asked why he considered the conditions to be *not difficult*. Another twenty-five year-old, who was a Black, female, violent offender, expressed the same sentiment as evident by her statement “I don’t have a problem with drugs or alcohol at all.” The theme can also A forty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender said, “I’ve never done drugs and alcohols...I don’t need to do it anymore.” Participants who rated the conditions requiring them to not possess or consume alcohol and/or drugs as being *not difficult* appeared to do so because they did not drink or use the substances.

Treatment programs or courses. Though participants were asked to expand on why they felt each of the eight specific treatment programs or courses (i.e., alcohol treatment, drug treatment, mental health treatment, employment programming, Milepost class, batterer’s intervention, anger management and driver’s class) was *not difficult*, two themes emerged regardless of the specific treatment programs or courses (Table 6-9). Probationers felt the conditions were *not difficult* to complete either because they had flexibility in selecting when they attended the programs or courses or because the program/course only required them to “sit there.” A twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender stated the treatment programs or courses “will work around your work schedule or whatever, to prior commitments that you have” when she was

explaining why she felt the treatment conditions were *not difficult*. Another public order offender, who was a twenty-seven year-old, White man, stated “they were lenient as to when you could sign up.”

The second theme that emerged was that individuals felt the conditions were *not difficult* because the treatment programs or courses did not require a lot of effort on the part of the probationers. The comment “it’s a matter of time and going and sitting in the room” was made by a forty year-old, White, female public order offender and highlighted this theme. A twenty-two year-old, White man, who was serving probation for a violent offense, shared this sentiment and stated “you just got to show up and pay attention.” Probationers who identified the treatment programs or courses as being *not difficult* to comply with or complete appeared to feel that way because the scheduling of the programs or courses was flexible or they felt that way because the program or course do not require a lot from the probationers.

Very difficult

Submit to random screens. I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data collected from the individuals who identified a submitting to random alcohol or drug screens as being *very difficult* (Table 6-9). Of the three individuals who identified the condition as being *very difficult*, only one person expanded on why. The twenty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender stated “‘cause I like smoking weed” when he was asked why he felt the condition was *very difficult*. It appeared that he felt the condition was *very difficult* because it required him to not smoke marijuana, which he enjoys doing. The condition was *very difficult* not because of the procedure of the screen but because it required him to abstain from engaging in an activity he enjoys.

Do not possess or consume alcohol and do not possess or consume illegal drugs. Among the participants' responses who identified the treatment conditions of

not possessing or consuming alcohol and not possessing or consuming illegal drugs I identified one theme (Table 6-9). Probationers enjoyed drinking or using drugs and therefore considered the conditions to be *very difficult* to adhere to or complete.

"Sometimes when you get off and you're just done with the day, you want to kick back and have a beer" was a comment made by a twenty-eight year-old, White, male public order offender when he was asked to expand on his ranking of the conditions as *very difficult*. A forty-eight year-old, Black, female, public order offender shared "I still like to drink and I still like to... so it's very hard to completely stop drinking because it's such a social thing around here." Another public order offender, who was twenty-eight years old, White and male, shared that the conditions were *very difficult* because "I like to smoke weed." It appears those probationers who identified the conditions as being *very difficult* to adhere to thought so because they enjoyed drinking and/or using drugs.

Treatment programs or courses. Despite being asked to specify for each particular treatment program or course that was identified as being *very difficult* to comply with, probationers often cited one of two reasons regardless of the actual program or course (Table 6-9). The first reason given by probationers who considered the treatment program or course to be *very difficult* was that the program or course was expensive. A twenty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender simply stated "payment" when he was asked to expand on why he considered the condition to be *very difficult*. Another public order offender, who is a forty-eight year-old, White man, shared the sentiment. His comment "it cost a lot of money" was similar to a fifty-one year-old,

White, male, public order offender's comment of "it was very expensive." Probationers appeared to feel the financial cost of the treatment program or class made the complying with the condition *very difficult*.

A second theme that emerged from the responses was that probationers felt treatment programs or classes were *very difficult* to adhere to because attending the program or course negatively interfered with their lives. A forty-eight year-old, White woman, who is serving probation for a public order offense, comment "it would conflict with my full time job" reflects this sentiment. A fifty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender expressed that the condition of attending a treatment program would be "tough on the family, and, um, tough being away from work." Probationers, who identified treatment programs or classes as being *very difficult* to comply with, considered them to be *very difficult* because of the cost associated with attending the programs or classes or because of how attending might interfere with their lives.

Summary of treatment conditions

I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data regarding why probationers felt the treatment conditions were either *not difficult* or *very difficult*. Probationers identified treatment conditions as being *not difficult* if they perceived the condition to be simple to complete and if the treatment program or class was flexible in terms of scheduling. Probationers also considered treatment conditions to be *not difficult* if they did not regularly engage in drinking alcohol and/or using drugs. On the other hand, probationers reported treatment conditions to be *very difficult* if they enjoyed drinking alcohol and/or using drugs. They also viewed conditions to be *very difficult* because of the costs associated with them and that they negatively interfered with their lives.

Punitive Conditions of Probation

Not difficult

Complete community service hours in lieu of fees and complete mandatory community service hours. The content analysis revealed that the probationers who identified the conditions involving community service hours as being *not difficult* did so because performing their community service hours required little work (Table 6-10). They suggested that completing their community service hours was *not difficult* because they were not required to do a lot in order to complete the hours. For example a thirty-four year-old, White, male, public order offender stated “I already started doing it and it’s pretty easy” when he was discussing why he considered the community service hours to be *not difficult*. “It’s what I do at my church. It’s not that difficult. I’m just on the computer system till Sunday. It’s not difficult” was a comment by a twenty-five year-old, Black man, serving probation for a property offense. When asked why they rated the community service conditions as *not difficult*, participants suggested that the conditions were *not difficult* because they were not required to do a lot of work and the tasks they were required to perform were simple.

Complete work crew days. The theme that emerged from the qualitative data regarding why they consider the condition of completing work crew days to be *not difficult* was the reason that individuals considered community service conditions *not difficult* to complete (Table 6-10). Probationers felt that completing work crew days did not require a great deal of effort on their part. A twenty-seven year-old, Black, male, property offender’s comment of “it’s not even hard, I used to love it, going to work crew” best highlights this theme. Those who rated the condition of completing work crew days

as being *not difficult* did so because completing the condition did not require a lot of work on their part.

Table 6-10. Punitive conditions of probations' qualitative themes

Condition	Not Difficult	Very Difficult
Community service in lieu of fees	Not much work required	Interferes with work
Mandatory community service	Not much work required	Interferes with work
Complete work crew days	Not much work required	Interferes with work
Complete a jail sentence	Over and done	Interferes with work Away from children
Pay restitution	Financial situation	Financial situation
No contact with victim	Do not want contact	Interferes with relationship
Attend one victim impact panel	Short time commitment	Emotional
Driver's license suspended/revoked	Other transportation options	Interferes with work Have to rely on others
Abide with order of impoundment	Can rely on others	Have to rely on others
Abide by curfew	Stays home	Restricts freedom

Complete a jail sentence. When I performed a content analysis on the participants' responses pertaining to why they rated the condition of completing a jail sentence as being *not difficult*, one theme emerged (Table 6-10). Participants who indicated the condition was *not difficult* appeared to feel so because they felt that when people complete a jail sentence they serve it and then they are done with it. In other words, they serve a jail sentence, which is typically short, and then the condition is complete. It does not require them to do or adhere to something throughout their entire probation sentence. A thirty-six year-old, White, female public order offender stated "done- completed in six days" when asked to expand on why she considered a jail

sentence to be *not difficult* to comply with or complete. Another public order offender, who was twenty-eight years old and a White man, shared this sentiment as evident in his statement “you’d be out and you’d be done with it.” People felt that completing a jail sentence would be *not difficult* because they would be able to complete the condition and then be done with it in a short time.

Pay restitution. As was true with two standard conditions that required payment (i.e., monthly cost of supervision and court costs), probationers considered the condition of paying restitution to be *not difficult* if they had the financial means to pay restitution (Table 6-10). A twenty-two year-old, Black man, who was on probation for a drug offense, said “I have a job.” It appears that completing the condition of paying restitution is rated as being *not difficult* because those rating it so have the money and ability to pay the restitution.

No contact with victim. The one theme that emerged when I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data that expanded on why participants rated the condition, no contact with victim, as being *not difficult* (Table 6-9). The theme was that people reporting the condition as being *not difficult* did so because they did not want to have contact with the victim regardless of the probation condition. A comment made by a twenty-five, Black, male, property offender highlights this sentiment; his comment was “I can’t stand the two of them,” referring to the two victims in his case. Another probationer, who was a twenty-three year-old, Black, female, violent offender, shared that she considered the condition to be *not difficult* because “we don’t talk anyways.” Those who rated the condition as being *not difficult* appeared to feel so because they

did not want to have contact with their victim(s) and therefore, the condition of having not contact with their victim(s) was *not difficult*.

Attend one victim impact panel. From the content analysis, I extracted one theme regarding the condition of attending a victim impact panel and why participants rated the condition as being *not difficult* (Table 6-10). Individuals considered the condition to be *not difficult* to complete because attending the victim impact panel only required a short time commitment. A twenty-five year-old, White, male, public order offender shared “I mean you just sit there for like an hour and forty-five minutes; it wasn’t a big deal” when he was asked to expand on the condition’s difficulty rating. This sentiment was shared by a forty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender as evident in her statement, “two hours out of the Friday night or Tuesday night; not a big deal.” Another public order offender, who was a twenty-one year-old, White woman, said “it was only a few hours.” Probationers who reported the condition of attending one victim impact panel as being *not difficult* to complete reported feeling so because the condition required a limited amount of time in order to complete it.

Driver’s license suspended/revoked. One theme emerged while I was examining the qualitative responses from individuals who rated the condition of having one’s driver’s license suspended or revoked as *not difficult* (Table 6-10). Participants considered the condition to be *not difficult* because there were other forms of transportation available to them. “I ain’t lazy. I got my feet. You got the bus” was a statement made by a twenty-eight year-old, White, male, public order offender when he was asked to expand on why he considered the condition to be *not difficult* and is a good example of the theme. Since alternative forms of transportation are available to

individuals, some probationers felt that having their driver's licenses suspended or revoked was *not difficult* to comply with or complete.

Abide by order of impoundment. The responses regarding why the condition of abiding by an order of impoundment is *not difficult* suggested that probationers felt they could rely on others (Table 6-9). A thirty-four year-old, White, male, public order offender expressed that "I can get rides" and that is why abiding by an order of impoundment was *not difficult* for him. Another probationer, who was a forty-one year-old, Black, female, public order offender, stated "you can find a ride." Those who rated the condition of abiding by an order of impoundment as being *not difficult* to adhere to considered it to be because they could rely on others for rides during the time period when their cars were impounded.

Abide by curfew. The final punitive condition was abiding by a curfew. The qualitative data that focused on the condition showed that probationers who felt the condition was *not difficult* because they did not typically go out and instead stayed home. A forty-one year-old, White woman, who was serving a probation sentence for a public order offense, shared "I don't go out late anyways" when she was asked why she felt the condition would be *not difficult* to comply with or complete. This sentiment was also held by a thirty year-old, Black, female, public order offender, whose comment was "I don't stay out all night." Another probationer, who was a twenty year-old, Black, female, property offender said "I'm always at home." The condition of abiding by a curfew appeared to be viewed as *not difficult* to follow by those who typically stayed home and therefore, the condition was *not difficult* to adhere to or complete.

Very difficult

Complete community service hours in lieu of fees and complete mandatory community service hours. I performed a content analysis on the participants' comments about why they ranked each particular punitive condition as *very difficult* (Table 6-10). When it came to the two conditions regarding completing community service hours, one theme emerged as to why individuals considered the conditions as being *very difficult*. A forty-eight year-old, White, female, public order offender shared "it's hard to do with a full time job," while a fifty-three year-old, White, male, public order offender stated "you have to maintain employment and um, depending on what the community service is, it might impede with your ability to work full time" when they were asked to expand why they rated the conditions as *very difficult*. Another probationer, who was a twenty-nine year-old, White, female, public order offender commented "I have a full time job and I have school; it's just hard with the hours." Those who identified the two punitive conditions that required them to complete community service hours felt the conditions were *very difficult* to complete because the community service hours interfered with their employment.

Complete work crew days. Probationers who reported the condition of completing work crew days to be *very difficult* appeared to feel so because it interfered with their employment (Table 6-10). "I have a job. It's kind of difficult for me to go to work and have to do work crew" was a comment made by a twenty-six year-old, Black woman, who was serving a probation sentence for a public order offense, and highlighted the sentiment. A forty-eight year-old, White, female, public order offender said "I have a full time job" when the interviewer asked her why she felt the condition was *very difficult*. There was only one theme extracted during the content analysis, and

that theme was that probationers reported completing work crew days as being *very difficult* because performing the work crew hours interfered with their employment.

Complete a jail sentence. As was the case in the three previously mentioned punitive conditions, the condition of completing a jail sentence was considered to be *very difficult* because it interfered with the probationers' employment (Table 6-10). A forty-eight year-old, White, female, public order offender said "it would conflict with my full time job" when asked why completing a jail sentence would be *very difficult* for her to comply with or complete. This view was shared by a twenty-nine year-old, Black, female, public order offender who stated "I probably would have got fired if I would have had to go to jail." Those who rated the condition as being *very difficult* did so because they felt the sentence would interfere with their employment.

An additional reason why probationers identified the condition as *very difficult* to complete or adhere to is because it kept them away from their children. An example of this theme is seen in a comment by a forty-five year-old, Black, female, public order offender, who stated "I have kids, and I have grandkids." Another probationer, who was a twenty-two year-old, Black, male, drug offender stated "I am the one that cares for my child...so if I am in jail there is nobody to take care of him." Participants who rated completing a jail sentence as being *very difficult* felt so because the condition interfered with their employment or because they had children.

Pay restitution. When I examined the qualitative data regarding paying restitution, the one theme I extracted was that probationers considered the condition to be *very difficult* based on their current financial situation (Table 6-10). As was the case with the conditions of paying the monthly cost of supervision and court costs,

probationers who were not financially sound rated the condition as being *very difficult*. A twenty year-old, Black, female, violent offender shared “the expenses are high,” while another twenty year-old, Black woman, who was a property offender said “I don’t have enough money.” “Some people don’t have the monies to pay” was a comment made by a twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender and highlighted the theme that emerged. Probationers who identified the condition of paying restitution as being *very difficult* did so because their current financial situation made it *very difficult* for them to complete the condition.

No contact with victim. While individuals who considered the condition of having no contact with their victim(s) was *not difficult* because they did not want anything to do with them, those who rated the condition as being *very difficult* did so because they had a personal relationship with their victim(s) (Table 6-10). In other words, probationers who identified not having contact with their victim(s) as being *very difficult* to comply did so because it required them to stay away from someone they typically had a lot of contact with prior to condition, as well as someone with whom they wanted contact. “It’s somebody I love” was a comment made by a twenty-six year-old, Black, man, serving probation for a public order offense. His comment highlights the theme that emerged, which was that the condition was *very difficult* because they wanted to have contact with the person due to them having a personal relationship with their victim. The condition interferes with their relationship.

Attend one victim impact panel. Among the responses regarding why attending a victim impact panel would be *very difficult* to complete and comply with, the only theme that emerged was that attending the panel would be very emotional and

therefore, *very difficult* (Table 6-10). When asked to expand on why he felt the condition would be *very difficult* to comply with, a thirty year-old, White, male, violent offender stated “I would say that would be very difficult because if I ever ran somebody over or hurt them or hurt anybody, it would be hard to sit there and face somebody.” Another probationer, who was a forty-three year-old, White, female, public order offender, simply said “it was very emotional.” Probationers who considered the condition of attending one victim impact panel to be *very difficult* reported identifying the condition as such because the panel would be emotionally difficult for them to complete.

Driver’s license suspended/revoked. Nearly 50% (N= 77, 47.5%) of the interviewees rated the condition of having their driver’s license suspended or revoked as being *very difficult*. When I performed a content analysis on the qualitative data, two themes emerged as to why probationers considered the condition to be *very difficult* (Table 6-10). The first theme was that individuals identified having their driver’s license suspended or revoked as being *very difficult* because the condition interferes with their employment. “I would say that’s very difficult because you can’t get to work” was a comment made by a thirty year-old, White, male, violent offender. This sentiment was also shared by a forty-eight year-old, Black, female, public order offender, who stated “I can’t get to my job, I can’t, I mean it makes it that much harder to get to my job.” When asked why she rated the condition as *very difficult*, a twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender replied “without my driver’s license it’s harder to get to work.”

In addition to the condition being considered *very difficult* because it interfered with their employment, probationers felt having their driver’s license suspended or revoked was *very difficult* because they had to rely on others for transportation. This theme can

be seen in the comments of a twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender. Her statement was “it’s really hard to get around. It’s difficult to ask people for it.” The condition that was identified as *very difficult* by more interviewees than any other condition was identified as being so because complying with the condition interfered with their employment and caused them to rely on others for rides.

Abide by order of impoundment. Individuals who reported the condition of abiding by an order of impoundment was *not difficult* felt so because they were able to rely on others for transportation (Table 6-10). However, those who reported the condition to be *very difficult* to comply with felt so because they were required to rely on others for transportation. “I would have to wake up at five o’clock to catch somebody going to work” was a statement made by a thirty-four year-old, Black, male, property offender. Another property offender, who was a forty-five, Black woman, said “you have to depend on someone else” when she was asked why she rated the condition as she did. The condition of impoundment is either seen as being *not difficult* or as being *very difficult* depending on how the probationers felt about having to rely on others for rides.

Abide by curfew. The content analysis extracted one theme regarding why abiding by a curfew is viewed as being *very difficult* to comply with or complete (Table 6-10). Probationers reported the condition was *very difficult* because it restricted their freedom. A sixty-four year-old, Black, male, violent offender’s comment of “it takes away my freedom” is an example of this sentiment, which was also shared by a twenty-three year-old, Black, male, violent offender. His comment was “takes away from me doing my thing at time that I want to do it and I won’t be able to do because I have my curfew, just makes it difficult.” It appears that probationers who rated the punitive

condition as being *very difficult* did so because complying with the curfew greatly restrict their freedom.

Summary of punitive conditions

Every time the participants would report a probation condition to be *not difficult* or *very difficult*, they were asked to expand on why they rated the condition as such. After performing a content analysis on the probationers' responses, I was able to extract several themes that explain the ratings. The punitive conditions were often reported as being *not difficult* if the probationer perceived that there was little effort required to complete the condition and if they had other options, such as relying on others for transportation. In the reverse, individuals identified some conditions as being *very difficult* because it require them to rely on others. Additionally, probationers often perceived the conditions to be very difficult because they interfered with their employment or personal relationship.

Overall Difficulty of Probation

In addition to rating each of the thirty-two probation conditions, participants were also asked to rate the difficulty of their probation sentence generally. Based on Petersilia and Deschene's (1994b) research, probationers were asked "what do you think about the difficulty of your sentence of probation" and ask was the case for the individual conditions they were given the response options of *not difficult* (1), *relatively easy* (2), *about 50/50* (3), *somewhat difficult* (4) and *very difficult* (5). Regardless of their rating, participants were asked "why do you feel this way? Please explain" and their responses were digitally-recorded and transcribed. I performed content analysis on participants' open-ended responses regarding why they ranked their probation sentence as they did.

Not difficult

When I examined the responses from those who identified their overall probation sentence as being *not difficult*, there was one major theme that emerged (Table 6-11). Probationers considered their probation sentence to be *not difficult* because there were not a lot of conditions they had to follow or complete. A twenty-two year-old, Black, male, drug offender's comment of "it's not difficult because the only think I have to do is submit to random drug screens and go to drug class which won't be that bad" expresses this sentiment. A forty year-old, Black, female, property offender shared that "it's nothing hard about doing probation because I don't do no drugs, I don't drink." Another female, property offender, who was White and forty-one years old, stated that she felt probation was *not difficult* because "there isn't too much for me to do or just kinda simple, or you just pay it, um, and just take the class." Participants who reported their probation sentence was *not difficult* appeared to feel so because they did not feel they had a lot of probation conditions to complete.

Table 6-11. Overall difficulty of probation sentences' qualitative themes

Response Options	Themes
Not difficult	Few requirements
Relatively easy	Financial costs
About 50/50	Financial costs Inconvenient
Somewhat difficult	Financial costs Too many requirements
Very difficult	Not being able to drive Negatively effects on personal life

Relatively easy

Among probationers who reported their probation sentence as being *relatively easy*, I identified one theme. Participants appeared to feel that their sentence of probation was *relatively easy* because they were not required to adhere or complete a lot of conditions but the financial conditions did cause them some difficulties. A twenty-four year-old, White, male, drug offender reported “the only thing that doesn’t make it easy is, um, court fees.” His view was shared by a twenty-six year-old, White, male, public order offender as evident by his comment of “I got off fairly easy I suppose. However, the cost is crippling. That’s definitely the hardest part.” The theme was also highlighted in a thirty-one year-old, White, male, public order offender’s statement, “I don’t have too many conditions to my, um, probation. It’s just paying off my fines that I owe.” Those who identified probation as being *relatively easy* reported that they do not have a lot conditions to comply with or complete, which was the sentiment expressed by those who identified probation to be *not difficult*. However, those who consider it to be *relatively easy* felt that the financial conditions placed some burden on them and therefore, listed their probation sentence as *relatively easy* versus *not difficult*.

About 50/50

There were two themes that emerged when I performed a content analysis on the participants’ responses regarding why their probation sentences were *about 50/50*. The first theme was that probationers felt the financial requirements increased the difficulty of their probation sentence. “It’s fifty-fifty because I don’t mind you know, um, obviously doing the time as far as a year goes and the suspension of the driver’s license. It’s just the money that I’m having to pay that’s really killing me” was a statement made by a forty-five year-old, White man, who was on probation for a public order offense.

Another participant, who was a sixty-one year-old, White, male public order offender stated “I’d say it’s like fifty-fifty, well I mean it’s, I mean, it’s mostly money coming up with the money” when asked why he considered his probation sentence to be *about 50/50*.

A twenty-nine year-old, female, White, public order offender simply expressed the theme by stating “about fifty-fifty only because of the money.”

The second theme expressed among those who reported their probation sentences to be *about 50/50* was that their probation sentences were inconvenient.

About fifty-fifty cause right now I was doin’ a little side job, and I had to take off from it to come here and I had to finish up in the morning then the weekend comes and I have to do the work crew and I hope I don’t have a little side job then cause if I do screw up the work crew, you know what I mean

was a comment made by a forty-eight year-old, Black, male public order offender who viewed his probation to be *about 50/50* because completing his conditions interfered with his everyday life. A forty-five year-old, Black, female, property offender merely stated “inconvenience.” Probationers who viewed their probation sentences to be *about 50/50* in terms of difficulty seemed to feel so because of their financial conditions or because their sentence was inconvenient to them.

Somewhat difficult

When I reviewed the participants’ responses for themes regarding why participants considered their probation to be *somewhat difficult* two themes emerged (Table 6-11).

The first theme was that probationers considered probation to be *somewhat difficult* because of how much they are required to pay. A thirty-three year-old, Black, male, public order offender shared that he felt his probation was *somewhat difficult* because of “paying the costs.” Another probationer reported the sentence to be “somewhat difficult...would be the money.” He was a thirty-one year-old, White man, serving a

probation sentence for a public order offense. Once again the probationers based their probation sentence difficulty rating on the financial requirements.

The second theme I extracted from the responses was that probationers considered their sentence to be *somewhat difficult* because they were required to complete or adhere to too many conditions. A twenty year-old, Black, female, property offender's comment of "somewhat difficult because for the small charge that I have they gave me too much to do, Friday work crew, community service and then I got to pay and it's too much to do" highlighted this theme. The theme was also evident in a comment made by a twenty-three year-old, White man, serving a public order offense; his comment was:

somewhat difficult, um, just, I mean with the interlock device and all the work crews and everything like that. I mean that, just the tough part about it. I mean I cannot break the law and go in once a month, that's fine but just the money and everything like that, interlock device, not being able to have a car is somewhat difficult.

Participants who reported to the interviewer that they considered their probation sentences to be *somewhat difficult* did so because of the financial cost they are required to pay or because they felt they had too many conditions to adhere to or complete.

Very difficult

Individuals who reported their probation sentences to be *very difficult* appeared to do so for two reasons. Some felt probation was *very difficult* because the condition of having one's driver license suspended or revoked made completing the other conditions of probation difficult. A sixty year-old, White, female, public order offender stated "as a whole I still feel that it's been very difficult and that has mostly to do with the cost and the driving. I don't know it just seems like it was extremely punitive in those, in those

ways” when she was asked why she rated her probation as *very difficult*. Another probationer, who was a thirty-two year-old, White, female, public order offender, shared:

because my situation, like I said, I can't drive anywhere, um, it's hard for me to get places, to do community service hours. It's hard for me sometimes to get to the probation office cause I live so far out and it's just really difficult in that way.

This sentiment was also shared by a forty-one year-old, Black, female, public order offender, as evident in her statement of “if I get a program on Saturday, I need somebody to take me there and pick me up in the afternoon. It's difficult.”

I also extracted the theme that probationers viewed their sentences to be *very difficult* because their probation sentences negatively affected their lives. One probationer, a twenty-nine year-old, White, male, public order offender candidly admitted that “my wife and I are going through a difficult time and being on probation is making it difficult” when he was asked to expand on his rating of *very difficult*. A twenty-nine year-old, White, female, public order offender stated that probation was *very difficult* for her because “I have to have somebody watch my kids.” Their probation sentences were inconvenient and negatively impacted their personal lives and therefore, they considered their sentences to be *very difficult*. Others considered their probation sentences to be *very difficult* because not having a driver's licenses made completing their other conditions of probation difficult.

Summary of the overall difficulty of probation

Probationers were asked to rate the difficulty of their probation sentence. Individuals who rated their sentence as being *not difficult* did so because they felt they did not have many requirements (i.e., conditions) to complete or follow. Participants who reported their probation as being *relatively easy* reported that the financial

requirements were the only conditions that were difficult. Those who identified their probation as being *about 50/50* voiced feeling that way because of the financial burden and the inconvenience placed on them by their probation sentence. Financial costs, as well as feeling they had too many conditions to comply with, were the reasons given by those who identified their probation sentence as *somewhat difficult*. Among the participants who rated their sentence as being *very difficult* two themes emerged. Some felt the condition was *very difficult* because of the condition of having their driver's license suspended or revoked was difficult to comply with, as well as made it difficult to complete other probation conditions. Additionally, probationers rated their sentence as being *very difficult* because their sentence negatively affected their personal lives. Probationers appeared to mainly rate their probation sentence in terms of difficulty based on the financial burden it placed on them.

Chapter Summary

This results chapter answered the sub-research question “do probationers’ views of the severity of a condition impact their perceived ability to complete a particular probation condition?” In the case of standard and treatment conditions, nearly 50% of the participants indicated the conditions to be *not difficult*. The financial conditions were exceptions to this. There was more variance among the punitive conditions, indicating that probationers tended to report the punitive condition as being more difficult to adhere to or complete. Notifying the probation officer of changes in employment was the condition with the highest percentages of interviewees identifying it as being *not difficult*, while having one's driver's license suspended or revoked was the condition with the highest percentage of participants reporting the condition as being *very difficult*. The percentages of interviewees that indicated probation conditions to be *not severe*

were similar to the percentage of interviewees that indicated the conditions to be *not difficult*. This suggests that participants consider how severe a condition is when determining how difficult conditions are to comply with or complete.

There were few significant predictors of the probation conditions' perceived difficulty. *Gender* and *severity* were significant predictors for multiple severity scales, with women being more likely to report particular probation conditions as being more difficult to comply with or complete. *Severity* was a significant predictor for seven scales out of the eleven difficult scales and variables. Probationers who perceived probation conditions to be more severe were more likely to identify probation conditions as being difficult to follow or complete than those who identified probation conditions as being *not severe*. In the case of most probation conditions, probationers' views of the severity of a condition does impact their perceived ability to complete a particular probation condition.

I also performed a content analysis on the qualitative data and identified common themes regarding why probationers identified conditions as being *not difficult* or *very difficult*. The themes varied by probation condition but conditions were often identified as being *not difficult* if complying with the condition did not require a great deal of time or effort on the part of the probationers. Additionally, if when the probationers could complete the condition was flexible and they had the financial means to afford the condition, the interviewees identified a condition to be *not difficult*. Probation conditions were often identified as being *very difficult* if the conditions interfered with their employment, their relationships or other aspects of their lives. Conditions were also viewed as being *very difficult* if the conditions restricted the probationers' behavior and if

they did not have the financial means to pay the conditions. In terms of how probationers viewed their probation sentence, interviewees mainly based their difficulty rating on how great of a financial burden the probation sentence placed on them. The quantitative and qualitative data suggests that probationers' perceived severity and financial situations were the biggest factors in determining how difficult they perceive probation and probation conditions to be.

CHAPTER 7 RESULTS: RESEARCH QUESTION 2C— OBSTACLES OF PROBATION

The second research question this paper answers is “what are probationers’ perceptions of their conditions of probation?” Chapters 5 and 6 examined how the probationers viewed their probation conditions in terms of severity and how difficult the conditions are to adhere to and complete. This chapter answers the sub-research question, “what do probationers see as potential obstacles that would hinder them from completing or adhering to the conditions of their probation?” This allows me to determine what were common obstacles for current probationers and, if and how do those obstacles influence their perceptions of their probation sentence. In this chapter, I analyze quantitative data by examining the probationers’ survey responses, correlations results, and regression model estimates. I also perform a content analysis on the qualitative data in order to further answer the sub-research question.

Quantitative Analysis

Percentages and Frequencies: Obstacles for Completing Probation

The interviewees were asked to indicate their level of agreement with twenty possible obstacles. For each item, I asked current probationers to indicate whether they felt the listed item was or could be a potential obstacle for them successfully completing or adhering to their probation sentence. Their response options were: *strongly disagree* (1), *disagree* (2), *agree* (3), and *strongly agree* (4) (Methods chapter for more details). Following data collection, I ran exploratory factor analysis and, based on the analysis, I created five obstacles scales¹ (Dependent Variables section for more details).

¹ Three possible variables were dropped from the scales due to the variables not loading at above a 0.5 on any factor. Maintaining a job, transportation to work crew and participating in treatment were dropped and not included in any of the five scales.

Mean scores

When I examined the mean scores for the five obstacles scales the majority of the scales and scale items corresponded to the response of *disagree*, indicating that the particular scale items were not considered to be obstacles that could prevent probationers from successfully completing probation (Table 7-1). The “transportation-attendance obstacle scale” was composed of obstacles related to transportation (i.e., transportation to work, report monthly, and community service location) and the obstacle of finding time to report monthly, while the “living environment scale” included obstacles that might be found in probationers’ lives and living situations (i.e., avoiding drinking alcohol and/or using drugs, lack of family support and neighborhood conditions). The mean scores for both scales range from 1.6² to 2.4 and equated to a response of *disagree*. Similarly, the “punitive obstacles scale’s” mean score and two of the three items had mean scores of 2.4 and indicated a response of *disagree*. The remaining scale item, finding time to do community service hours, had a mean score of 2.5 and when rounded equated to the response option of *agree*. The means scores suggest that the majority of probationers disagreed that the “transportation-attendance obstacle scale,” “living environment scale” items, and “punitive obstacles scale” were potential obstacles for them successfully adhering to or completing probation. The only exception was finding time to do community service hours, which was seen as an obstacle.

The remaining two obstacles scales had mean scores that indicated an answer response of *agree* (Table 7-1). The “responsibility obstacle scale” was composed of

² I rounded the mean scores if the value was 0.5 or higher to the next response option.

Table 7-1. Percentages for obstacles scales based on factor analysis

Scales based on factor analysis	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale						2.3
Item 1: Finding time to report monthly	202	30.2	45.0	17.8	6.9	2.0
Item 2: Transportation to work	189	25.4	28.0	27.5	19.0	2.4
Item 3: Transportation to report monthly	200	27.5	35.0	22.5	15.0	2.3
Item 4: Transportation to do CS hours	191	28.8	29.8	25.1	16.2	2.3
Responsibility Obstacle Scale						2.5
Item 1: Finding a job	198	26.3	22.2	27.3	24.2	2.5
Item 2: Finding a good job	196	15.8	17.3	29.1	37.8	2.9
Item 3: Maintaining a residence	199	38.7	32.2	16.6	12.6	2.0
Tracking Obstacles Scale						2.6
Item 1: Paying court costs	195	11.8	23.6	36.4	28.2	2.8
Item 2: Paying monthly COS	200	12.0	30.0	31.5	26.5	2.7
Item 3: Number of probation conditions	198	26.8	30.3	27.3	15.7	2.3
Punitive Obstacles Scale						2.4
Item 1: Finding time to do CS hours	193	17.6	31.1	32.1	19.2	2.5
Item 2: Finding time to do work crew	162	29.6	22.2	29.6	18.5	2.4
Item 3: Paying restitution	162	27.8	22.8	27.2	22.2	2.4
Living Environment Scale						1.8
Item 1: Avoiding drinking alcohol	193	40.9	36.8	17.1	5.2	1.9
Item 2: Avoiding using drugs	191	55.0	35.1	7.3	2.6	1.6
Item 3: Lack of family support	197	46.2	38.6	10.2	5.1	1.7
Item 4: Neighborhood conditions	198	43.9	32.3	15.2	8.6	1.9

three items that require probationers to take responsibility (i.e., find a job, find a good job and maintain a residence). The two items related to employment had mean scores that equated to *agree*, while the item of maintaining a residence's mean score equated to *disagree*. The scale, "tracking obstacles scale," had similar findings. Two of the items' (i.e., paying court cost and paying monthly cost of supervision) mean scores equated to *agree*, and the remaining item, number of probation conditions, equated to *disagree*. The two scales' mean responses mainly corresponded to the answer of *agree*, which indicated the probationers considered the scale items to be potential obstacles.

Summary of the mean scores. The majority of the obstacle scales and scale items had mean scores that corresponded with the response of *disagree*. The response of *disagree* indicated that probationers did not consider the scales items to be potential obstacles. The remaining scales and scale items' mean scores corresponded to the answer option, *agree*, which indicated that they viewed the items as being potential obstacles. None of the scales or scale items' mean scores equated to the response of *strongly disagree* or *strongly agree*.

Percentages and frequencies: Factor analysis-based scales

Transportation-attendance obstacle scale. Next, I examined the participants' responses per item (Table 7-1). Between 25 to 30% of interviewees *strongly disagreed* that the four scale items were potential obstacles of their probation success. Fewer than 7% (N= 14, 6.9%) *strongly agreed* that the condition of finding time to report to the probation office monthly was an obstacle for them. However, slightly more *strongly agreed* that finding transportation to work, to the probation office and to community service location was an obstacle for them successfully completing probation. More

individuals did not see reporting monthly and finding transportation as obstacles than felt them to be obstacles for completing probation.

Responsibility obstacle scale. The “responsibility obstacle scale” had more variance in participants’ responses than the previous scale (Table 7-1). Nearly 40% (N=77, 38.7%) of the interviewees *strongly disagreed* that maintaining a residence was an obstacle for them, while only 13% (N= 25, 12.6%) *strongly agreed* it was an obstacle. The other two scale items addressed employment as a potential obstacle. A similar percentage of probationers *strongly disagreed* that finding a job was an obstacle for them as who *strongly agreed* that finding a job was an obstacle. When it came to finding a good job, only 16% (N= 31, 15.8%) *strongly disagreed* it was an obstacle. Nearly 40% (N=74, 37.8%) of the sample *strongly agreed* that finding a good job would be an obstacle for them. It appears that probationers do not consider maintaining a residence to be an obstacle, while an equal number of probationers considered finding a job to be an obstacle as did not. However, when it came to finding a good job, more probationers considered that to be an obstacle than did not.

Tracking obstacles scale. The “tracking obstacles scale” was composed of three items, two of which were possible financial obstacles (Table 7-1). Slightly more than 10% of the sample felt that paying their court costs and paying their monthly cost of supervision was not an obstacle for them. However, nearly 30% of the sample did consider them to be obstacles for them successfully completing their probation. The third scale item, number of probation conditions was the reverse. Nearly 30% (N= 53, 26.8%) *strongly disagreed* that the number of conditions they have to comply with was a potential obstacle for them. Sixteen percent (N= 31, 15.7%) of the respondents did

consider the number of probation conditions was an obstacle for them. The two financial requirements comprising the scale were seen by over a quarter of the probationers as being obstacles for them successfully completing probation, while over a quarter considered the number of conditions they were required to complete or adhere to was not an obstacle.

Punitive obstacles scale. I examined the participants' responses regarding the three items comprising the "punitive obstacles scale" (Table 7-1). Nearly 30% of the interviewees indicated that they *strongly disagreed* that finding time to do work crew days and paying their restitution was or could be an obstacle for them. In terms of finding the conditions to be obstacles, nearly 20% (N= 30, 18.5%) did consider finding time to do work crew days an obstacle, while slightly more than 20% (N= 36, 22.2%) reported paying restitution is or would be an obstacle. The third scale item had a similar percentage of probationers reporting it (i.e., finding time to do community service hours) to not be an obstacle as reported the condition to be an obstacle. More interviewees considered finding time to do work crew days and paying restitution to not be obstacles than considered them to be obstacles. Finding time to do community service hours had a similar number of respondents reporting it to be an obstacle as did not.

Notification scale. The final obstacle scale had the highest percentage of participants indicating the scale items to not be obstacles than any other obstacle scale (Table 7-1). Over 40% of those interviewed felt that avoiding drinking alcohol, the support of their family and the conditions of their neighborhood were not obstacles for them successfully completing probation. Even more (over 55% (N= 105, 55.0%)) of the sample reported that avoiding using drugs was not an obstacle for them. This, then,

was considered an obstacle by the least number of people. Less than 10% of the sample identified the four scale items as being possible obstacles for them successfully completing their probation sentence. More probationers *strongly disagreed* with the items in this scale as being obstacles than *strongly agree* with the four other scales' items being obstacles.

Summary of frequencies and percentages. Of the seventeen potential obstacles that composed the five obstacles scale, thirteen possible obstacles were viewed by more probationers as not being obstacles than were viewed by probationers as being obstacles. In other words, the majority of listed potential obstacles had most probationers reporting that they were not obstacles for the probationers successfully completing their probation. Four potential obstacles were reported as being obstacles by more of the interviewees than were reported as not being obstacles. The conditions of finding a good job, paying court costs, paying monthly cost of supervisions and finding time to do community service hours were reported as being obstacles by more probationers than by probationers reported as not being obstacles. Finding a good job had the highest percentage of respondents reporting it to be an obstacle, while avoiding using drugs had the fewest percentage of respondents indicating it to be an obstacle. More of the potential obstacles were reported as not being obstacles for probationers' success on probation than there reported obstacles.

Correlations and Regressions: Obstacles for Completing Probation

After I examined the frequencies, I ran correlations with the five obstacles scale and the twenty-three independent variables (Tables 7-2 and Appendix K for correlations by scale item). The independent variables used were categories as being a personal characteristic, a previous criminal history or a current offense and probation sentence

Table 7-2. Correlations of obstacles scales and personal characteristics variables

	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale	-0.12	-0.02	0.01	0.10	-0.02	-0.15*	-0.12	0.02	0.01
Responsibility Obstacle Scale	-0.17*	-0.02	-0.10	0.04	-0.03	0.05	-0.08	-0.16*	0.14
Tracking Obstacles Scale	-0.12	0.06	-0.12	0.14	0.07	-0.02	-0.06	-0.08	-0.04
Punitive Obstacles Scale	-0.08	0.01	-0.11	0.21*	0.03	0.03	-0.00	0.11	0.15
Living Environment Scale	-0.15*	-0.01	0.03	0.04	-0.07	-0.12	-0.19	-0.10	0.09

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 7-3. Correlations of obstacles scales and previous criminal history variables

	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale	-0.17*	0.01	-0.08	-0.10	0.05	-0.02	-0.03
Responsibility Obstacle Scale	-0.07	0.07	0.08	-0.13	0.02	-0.07	-0.05
Tracking Obstacles Scale	-0.11	-0.05	-0.03	-0.10	-0.05	-0.08	-0.06
Punitive Obstacles Scale	-0.08	-0.10	-0.11	-0.12	-0.07	-0.07	-0.10
Living Environment Scale	-0.03	-0.01	0.07	-0.14	-0.01	-0.08	-0.14

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 7-4. Correlations of obstacles scales and current offense and probation sentence variables

	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation	Severity
Transportation- Attendance Obstacles Scale	-0.13	-0.05	-0.01	0.07	0.05	-0.06	-0.04	0.19
Responsibility Obstacle Scale	0.02	-0.01	0.12	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.10	0.22
Tracking Obstacles Scale	-0.01	0.01	0.07	-0.06	-0.05	0.07	0.11	0.12
Punitive Obstacles Scale	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.16*	-0.07	0.05	0.13	0.22
Living Environment Scale	-0.02	0.09	0.05	0.09	-0.01	0.02	-0.00	-0.02

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

variable; the twenty-three independent variables were the ones used in both the severity and difficulty analysis. Next, I ran ordinary least squares linear (OLS) regression regressions for the variables correlated at the bivariate level (Appendix L for regression tables that included all the independent variables).

Transportation-attendance obstacles scale

Parental status, which measured whether a participant had a child (or children), and *previous history*, which measure whether a participant had at least one previous arrest, were the only significant independent variables at the bivariate level (Tables 7-2). Next, an OLS regression model was estimated with the two variables and the dependent variable, “transportation-attendance obstacle scale¹.” *Parental status* and *previous history* failed to remain significant (Table 7-3). Whether an individual had a child or children and/or whether a person had a criminal history were not predictors of whether they considered reporting monthly to the probation office and finding transportation to get to the probation office, their place of employment and/or community service location was an obstacle for them.

Responsibility obstacle scale

There were two personal characteristics, *age* and *employment status*, that were significant at the bivariate level for the “responsibility obstacle scale²”. Both variables³

¹ For each obstacle scale, I ran a regression model with all twenty-three independent variable regardless of whether the variables were significant at the bivariate level. *Offense type* was the only significant predictor for the “transportation-attendance obstacles scale” (b= -0.43, p= 0.010) (Appendix L). The model estimated indicated as the severity of individuals’ current offense charges increased so did the likelihood of them identifying that reporting monthly to the probation agency and finding transportation were obstacles for them successfully completing their probation. When I ran the full models some variables that were not significant at the bivariate level became significant when all the variables were placed in the model. It is possible that *offense type* does not predict well individually, but does jointly. However, since the F-statistic was non-significant, there is little to no predictive capability in the model.

² Two independent variables were identified as significant predictors when an OLS model was estimated with all the independent variables and the dependent variable, “responsibility obstacle scale” (Appendix

continued to be significant when the OLS model was estimated (*age*: $b = -0.12$, $p = 0.014$; *employment status*: $b = -0.276$, $p = 0.029$) (Table 7-2 and 7-3). The negative relationship between *age* and the scale items suggested that as age decreased the likelihood of the person reporting the conditions to be obstacles increased. Additionally, those who reported currently being unemployed were more likely to identify the scale's conditions to be potential obstacles for them completing probation. Those who were employed and those who were older were more likely to indicate that finding a job, finding a good job and maintaining a residence were not obstacles for them successfully completing their probation sentence.

Tracking obstacle scale

None of the independent variables were significantly correlated with the dependent variables and therefore, I did not run an OLS regression with the "tracking obstacle scale"⁴ (Table 7-2 and Appendix L). None of the independent variables were correlated with the scale composed of financial obstacles (i.e., paying court costs and paying cost of supervision) and the obstacle of having too many probation conditions to adhere to or complete.

L). *Sample* ($b = 0.49$, $p = 0.047$) and *violation of probation* ($b = 0.65$, $p = 0.045$) were significant predictors. Probationers who composed the convenient sample and who had received a violation of probation were more likely to identify the scale's items as being potential obstacles for them. It is possible that when combined with the other variables, their joint predictive capability was seen. However, it should be noted that the predictive capability of the model is non-existent or limited because the F-statistic was non-significant.

³ In order to assess multicollinearity I used two collinearity diagnostic factors. Multicollinearity was not a problem in any of the models since there were no variables with tolerance value below 0.40 or had a variance inflation factor (VIF) above 2.5.

⁴ Though none of the variables were correlated at the bivariate level, when I ran OLS regression with all the independent variables, *technical violation* ($b = 0.68$, $p = 0.031$) was a significant predictor. Probationers who had received a technical violation were more likely to identify the scale items as being potential obstacles for them. The significant relationship may be due to chance or due to technical violations needed to be in conjunction with other variables in order for the relationship to appear. The F-statistics was non-significant, indicating the model had little or no predictive capability.

Punitive obstacles scale

One personal characteristic, *ethnicity*, and one current offense and probation sentence variable, *charge level reduction*, were correlated at the bivariate level for the “punitive obstacles scale⁵” (Tables 7-2). Both *ethnicity* ($b = 0.87, p = 0.008$) and *charge level reduction* ($b = 0.36, p = 0.038$) remained significant in the OLS regression (Table 7-3). Hispanics were more likely to consider the scale items as being obstacles, as were those who had their current charge reduced from a more severe criminal offense. In comparison to non-Hispanics and probationers who did not have their original charges reduced, Hispanics and those whose criminal offense was reduced from a felony or a first-degree misdemeanor were more likely to consider finding time to complete work crew days and/or community service hours and paying restitution were potential obstacles for them successfully completing probation.

Table 7-3. Predicting obstacle of probation

Variable	Scale		
	Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale	Standard Error	Beta
Parental status	-0.20	0.13	-0.12
Previous history	-0.25	0.14	-0.14
Constant	2.55	0.12	
R-square	0.04		
Adjusted R-square	0.03		
Standard error of the estimate	0.83		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	3.73*		
N	182		

⁵ As was the case with the reduced models, *ethnicity* ($b = 1.22, p = 0.023$) and *technical violations* ($b = 0.80, p = 0.042$) were predictors of the “notification scale” when the full model was run (Appendix L). *Marital status* ($b = -0.82, p = 0.042$) also was significant. Hispanics, those who were not married and those who received a technical violation were more likely to report the “punitive obstacles scale” items were potential obstacles for them completing probation. The variable, *marital status*, may have become significant due to chance or because when combined with other variables, its joint predictive capability is seen. It should be noted that the predictive capability of the model may be limited, because the F-statistic was non-significant.

Table 7-3. Continued

Scale			
Responsibility Obstacles Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Age	-0.01*	0.01	-0.18
Employment status	-0.28*	0.13	-0.16
Constant	3.09	0.21	
R-square	0.06		
Adjusted R-square	0.05		
Standard error of the estimate	0.86		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	4.07**		
N	192		
Punitive Obstacles Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Ethnicity	0.87**	0.32	0.21
Charge level reduction	0.36*	0.17	0.17
Constant			
R-square	0.07		
Adjusted R-square	0.06		
Standard error of the estimate	0.84		
Degrees of freedom	2		
F-value	5.63**		
N	151		
Living Environment Scale			
Variable	b	Standard Error	Beta
Age	-0.01*	0.00	-0.15
Constant	2.02	0.13	
R-square	0.02		
Adjusted R-square	0.02		
Standard error of the estimate	0.55		
Degrees of freedom	1		
F-value	4.39*		
N	188		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Living environment scale

Age was correlated with the “living environment scale⁶” at the bivariate level (Tables 7-2 and 7-3). A model with *age* as predictor was run and *age* remained significant ($b = -0.01$, $p = 0.037$) (Table 7-3); as *age* increased the likelihood of them identifying the “living environment scale” items as obstacles decreased. *Age* predicted whether probationers perceived avoiding alcohol and/or drugs, their level of family support and their neighborhood conditions to be obstacles for them successfully completing their sentence of probation.

Summary of correlations and regressions

There were very few variables that were significantly correlated and in the case of the “tracking obstacles scale” there were no variables correlated. I ran OLS regressions with the few variables that were significant at the bivariate level and none of the obstacles scales had more than three variables correlated. *Age* was the variable that was a significant predictor for more than one scale, with those being younger being more likely to agree that the scale items as being obstacles. The independent variables *race*, *gender*, *marital status*, *years of education*, *sample*, *seriousness history*, *prior violent offense*, *prior violation*, *jail history*, *prior sentence history*, *current offense type*, *violent offense*, *plea bargain*, *violation of probation*, *new law violation*, *technical violation* and *severity* were not significant at the bivariate level for any of the obstacles scales.

⁶ I ran OLS regression with all the independent variables and “living environment scale” as the dependent variable and *prior probation* ($b = -0.39$, $p = 0.032$) and *violent offense* ($b = -0.80$, $p = 0.006$) were significant (Appendix L). Individuals who had served a prior sentence of probation and were on probation for a violent offense were more likely to report the scale items to be potential obstacles. When combined with other variables, their predictive model may be seen, though the model itself had limit to no predictive power because the F-static was non-significant.

Few variables were significant in predicting probationers' agreement with the listed items being obstacles.

Qualitative Analysis

In addition to examining quantitative data, I also examined qualitative data for themes that may further help answer Research Question 2c, which focused on obstacles that probationers do or may face that could prevent them from completing probation. Probationers were asked “what do you think are some possible obstacles that you will face or are facing that could prevent you from successfully completing or adhering to your conditions of probation?” I performed a content analysis on the recorded interviews' transcripts and the interviewer's note from the interviews not recorded looking for themes pertaining to potential obstacles. I identified six obstacles that were repeatedly reported by probationers (Table 7-4).

Table 7-4. Qualitative themes of the obstacles for probation

Obstacles	N	%
Financial	46	22.8
Community service hours	21	10.4
Transportation	19	9.4
Alcohol and/or drugs	15	7.4
People, places and things	16	7.9
Health conditions	7	3.5
No obstacles	36	17.8
Refused/other	42	20.8

Potential Obstacles

Financial obligations

Interviewees frequently expressed concern that they considered the financial obligations that their probation sentence imposed on them to be obstacles for them successfully completing their sentence of probation (Table 7-4). Roughly 23% (N= 46, 22.8%) of probationers considered the conditions of paying court costs, cost of

supervision and restitution, as well as the financial costs required to complete probation conditions involving court-ordered treatment programs and classes, were reported to be potential reasons why they would not successfully complete probation. Probationers reported they would not be able to afford to pay and therefore, not complete the probation condition.

When asked to identify any potential obstacles, a fifty-three year-old, White, male, public order offender stated:

I would say, uh, the financial limitations are perhaps the most difficult, um, in terms of completing probation. I'm thinking, uh, the actual things I'm being asked to do are not difficult, um, but considering my circumstances of being unemployed, I'm having to make adjustments, um, in my budget and that sort of things.

A fifty-five year-old, White, female, violent offender also shared this sentiment, as evident by her statement "paying, paying the money is one obstacle, um, that's about it and see, everything else I can do and it's all the classes and all the money you have to pay out. I think that's the biggest obstacle for anybody." Another violent offender, who was thirty-five years old and a White man, shared "not being able to pay for the apartment and not being able to pay for the probation, uh, yeah, just like the overall fines and fees. They may very well cost me my freedom." A forty-five year-old, White, male, public order offender simply stated "paying the fines is the only issue I might run into." No matter the exact wording, many probationers interviewed expressed feeling that not being able to pay the financial obligations imposed on them could potentially lead them to unsuccessfully complete their probation sentences.

Community service hours

The second obstacle I identified based on participants' responses was completing community service hours (Table 7-4). Ten percent (N=21, 10.4%) of the interviewees

expressed concern that they may not be able to complete all their required community service hours and that failure to complete the community service hours could lead to them violating their probation. “Just finding, connecting with the right people. I work full time so it’s hard with my schedule such that nobody wants to play after work or on weekends short from taking time off of work to complete it” was a comment made by a sixty-two year-old, White, male, public order offender, while a twenty-nine year-old, Hispanic, Black, male, drug offender stated, “I work at night. I can only sleep during the day and no one’s open for community service at night.” A twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender also expressed difficulty finding time to perform her community service hours. Her statement was “trying to complete the hours of community service on time because their hours of operation really conflict with my schedule.” Another White, female, public order offender, who was thirty-two years old, shared the sentiment as evident by her statement:

Trying to get all of my community service hours done in the short amount of time that I had with a full time job not to mention the place where I do my community service hours. They have so many people already and it’s hard to connect with them especially during the week and the afternoon to get to them.

Being able to complete their court-ordered community service hours was seen as a potential obstacle by some of those interviewed.

Transportation

In addition to the not being able to pay their financial obligations and/or complete their community service hours, probationers also listed transportation as a potential obstacle (Table 7-4). Since probationers are often required to go to various locations in order to complete their probation conditions (e.g., community service locations, treatment programs locations, probation agencies), nearly 10% (N=19, 9.4%) of the

probationers expressed concern that not being able to drive themselves to the various locations may prevent them from completing their probation. Often these probationers had lost their licenses due DUI charges, while others never possessed valid driver's licenses or had their licenses suspended or revoked prior to being placed on probation. When asked to identify any obstacles that she may face while on probation, a twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender stated, "transportation to get where I need to go to successfully complete my probation." A twenty-three year-old, White, male, violent offender responded "the most important factor is not being able to drive to places myself" when he was asked the same question. A twenty-five year-old, White woman, who was serving a probation sentence for a public order offense, said "getting, um, transportation to, like, getting DUI school done." Transportation was identified as being an obstacle by some probationers, since some conditions required them to go various locations.

Alcohol and/or drugs

While I was coding interviewees' responses I noted that some probationers (N=15, 7.4%) admitted a potential obstacle for them was avoiding substances (i.e., alcohol and drugs) (Table 7-4). They expressed that if they were not able to stop drinking alcohol and/or using drug, they may fail to successfully complete their probation. A forty-three year-old, White, female, violent offender candidly said "the drug screening could come back dirty from opiates and she might violate me" when she was asked whether she was facing any potential obstacles. A drug offender, who was a twenty-five years old and a White woman, shared the only obstacle for her was "relapsing, I can sometimes stop but the next day, but if I choose to get mad on a day when I have to go in that week, I'm pretty much screwed." Another drug offender, who was forty-four-years-old

and a Black woman, simply said “relapse.” Some interviewees admitted that an obstacle for them successfully completing probation was that they may have difficulty not drinking alcohol and/or using drugs.

People, places and things

The fifth obstacle I identified while performing a content analysis was that some probationers felt particular people, places and things may hinder them successfully completing probation (Table 7-4). Nearly 8% (N=16, 7.9%) of the probationers identified particular people, places and things as obstacles for them. When asked if he was facing any potential obstacles that may prevent him from successful completing or adhering to his probation, a twenty-five year-old, Black, male, public order offender relayed “I would say just getting away from negative people, places and things.” A twenty-three, year-old, Black, male, violent offender shared this sentiment, as evident in his statement “staying from around negative people.” Some interviewees considered certain people, places and things to be obstacles for them successfully completing probation.

Health conditions

The final obstacle identified by probationers was that their health conditions may prevent them from completing their probation sentence (Table 7-4). Fewer than 5% (N=7, 3.5%) of the sample identified their health conditions as an obstacle. A fifty-nine year-old, Black, male, violent offender stated:

my health. Right now I’m going through this cancer and it’s in my mouth and right now it’s having my stomach hurting and my mouth is hurting. I take pain pills for it but you know that only last for a little while and I have to keep taking them or I may end up in the hospital

when he was asked if he was facing any potential obstacles. Another probationer, who was a forty-four year-old, Black, male, public order offender, said “I’m like disabled, and I really can’t do the (community service) hours like I’m supposed to because I ain’t supposed to work at all” when asked the same question. A twenty-five year-old, White, female, public order offender also expressed that her condition was an obstacle for her. Her comment was “I was pregnant while on probation which prevented me from completing my community service hours on time.” The health conditions of some probationers were identified as being potential obstacles for them successfully completing their sentences of probation.

No Potential Obstacles

Based on the interviewees’ statements, I identified six potential obstacles. However, when asked to identify some possible obstacles that they were or could be facing that could potentially prevent them from successfully completing their probation, some probationers stated that they were not facing any obstacles (Table 7-4). Nearly 20% (N= 36, 17.8%) of the sample did not identify any possible obstacles. Many of them simply said “no” like a twenty-five year-old, White, female, violent offender or “nope” like a thirty year-old, White, male, violent offender when they were asked the question. A forty-three year-old, White woman, who was serving probation for a public offense, expressed the same sentiment and said “there’s no obstacle.” Though many probationers did state that there were potential obstacles that might prevent them from successfully completing probation, a portion of the sample did report that they did not feel they were facing anything that would prevent them from successfully completing or adhering to their probation sentences.

Summary of Obstacles

Based on participants' open-ended responses, I identified six obstacles that were frequently reported by participants. The participants reported that the required financial components of their probation (e.g., court costs, cost of supervision, restitution, treatment program fees) are obstacles for them. Participants also expressed concern about them being able to complete all their required community service hours. The third obstacle I identified was transportation to the various locations they are required to go in order to fulfill some of their probation conditions. Several interviewees candidly admitted that avoiding alcohol and/or drugs would be obstacles for them. Other probationers felt that particular people, places and things might hinder their success on probation, while others said that their health conditions was an obstacle for them completing their probation conditions. Though the majority of those interviewed identified one of six obstacles (e.g., financial obligations, community service hours, transportation, alcohol and/or drugs, people, place and things and health conditions), a portion of them did report that they did not feel they were facing any obstacles that could prevent them from successfully completing their probation sentences.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I answered the sub-research question "what do probationers see as potential obstacles that would hinder them from completing or adhering to the conditions of their probation?" In regards to quantitative data, the majority of the obstacle scales and scale items' mean scores corresponded with the answer option of *disagree*, indicating that individuals did not find the items to be obstacles. Examining the percentages, more of the listed possible obstacles were identified by participants as not being obstacles than there were reported to be obstacles. The obstacle of avoiding

using drugs had the fewest number of participants reporting it to be an obstacle, while the obstacle of finding a good job had the greatest number of participants reporting it to be a potential obstacle for their successful completion of probation. There were few variables significant at the bivariate level and *Age* was the only variable that was a significant predictor for more than one scale. Younger probationers were more likely to agree with the scale items being obstacles for them successfully completing or adhering to their probation conditions.

Qualitative data collected further helped answer the question. Through content analysis, I identified six obstacles that probationers reported facing that could potentially hinder their ability to successfully adhere or complete probation. Probationers identified being able to financially afford all their financial obligations, completing their community service hours, finding transportation to various probation conditions' locations, and avoiding alcohol and/or drugs amongst those who drink and/or use as being possible obstacles. Other probationers reported that particular people, places and things and their health conditions as being potential obstacles for them completing their probation sentence. However, some probationers did indicate that they were not facing any possible obstacles.

CHAPTER 8 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

First, I summarize the study's findings for both research questions and review previous literature. Then, I describe the limitations of the study and make suggestions for future research. Finally, I make policy suggestions.

Summary of Findings

Using official records and self-report data, the first research question, "what are the conditions of probation that clients face in Alachua County," was answered by examining the frequencies and percentages of the probation condition received by the interviewees. The majority of the participants reported that the eleven standard conditions included in the interview instrument applied to them. The exception to this was that nearly a third of the probationers did not realize that their probation officers were allowed to visit their residences and over 50% of them did not know that their probation officers could visit their places of employment. Official records indicated that over half of the probationers had at least one treatment condition as part of their probation sentence; the percentage was higher according to the self-report data. Official estimates of punitive conditions were similar to self-report estimates. There were nineteen additional probation conditions (e.g. ignition interlock device, letter of apology, parenting class, etc.) received by the interviewees that were not included in the interview instrument. The additional conditions were not commonly imposed on probationers and often the interviewees did not self-report having receiving the additional conditions. Overall, the probationers being supervised by Alachua County Probation appeared to be familiar with most of the probation conditions that they are required to follow or complete.

The second research question this study answered was “what are probationers’ perceptions of their conditions of probation?” This question was first answered by answering the sub-question, “do the conditions of probation fall on a continuum when it comes to severity? If so, which conditions are viewed as being most severe?” The probation conditions included in the study do appear to be fall on a continuum (Table 8-1). Most of the standard and treatment conditions were perceived by the probationers as being less severe than punitive conditions.

When examining the percentages of probationers’ reporting the condition to be *not severe* the condition of notifying the probation officer of changes in residence was identified as being the least severe condition. The condition of having one’s driver’s license suspended and/revoked was identified as being the most severe condition. Probationers often reported that they viewed probation conditions as being *not severe* if the conditions were perceived to be not difficult to complete, as helpful, and/or as reasonable. Conditions were typically viewed as being *extremely severe* if they were perceived as difficult to complete, expensive and/or if the conditions were thought to negatively impact the probationers’ lives. Most probationers generally did not perceive their probation conditions to be severe.

The second sub-research question “do probationers’ views of the severity of a condition impact their perceived ability to complete a particular probation condition?” further answered the study’s second research question. The study’s results suggest that probationers do consider the perceived severity of probation conditions in determining the perceived difficulty of complying or adhering to probation conditions. The percentage of probationers that reported probation conditions to be *not severe* was

similar to the percentage of probationers that reported probation conditions to be *not difficult*.

Table 8-1. Condition continuum based on *extremely severe* responses percentages

Conditions	%	Condition Classification
Driver's license suspended/revoked	40.7	Punitive
Complete a jail sentence	37.3	Punitive
Pay court costs	24.1	Standard
Complete work crew days	23.4	Punitive
Abide with order of impoundment	22.2	Punitive
Abide by curfew	20.8	Punitive
Pay monthly cost of supervision	17.2	Standard
Complete mandatory community service hours	16.6	Punitive
Allow probation officer to visit employment site	16.0	Standard
Pay restitution	13.8	Punitive
Complete community service hours in lieu of fees	13.6	Punitive
Try to obtain employment	13.4	Standard
Submit to random screens	13.3	Treatment
No contact with victim	12.1	Punitive
Report to probation once a month	10.9	Standard
Do not possess or consume alcohol	10.3	Treatment
Commit no new law violation	10.1	Standard
Allow probation officer to visit residence	9.7	Standard
Complete Batterer's Intervention	8.9	Treatment
Do not possess or consume drugs	8.1	Treatment
Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer	7.9	Standard
Participate in drug treatment	7.8	Treatment
Maintain employment/enrollment	7.5	Standard
Attend one victim impact panel	6.6	Punitive
Attend driver's course	6.3	Treatment
Participate in alcohol treatment	6.1	Treatment
Participate in mental health treatment	6.0	Treatment
Complete Milepost class	5.9	Treatment
Notify probation officer of changes in employment	5.6	Standard
Complete anger management	5.6	Treatment
Notify probation officer of changes in residence	5.4	Standard
Participate in employment program	4.7	Treatment

Nearly half of the probationers identified most of the standard and treatment conditions to be *not difficult*, while most probationers reported the punitive conditions to be more difficult to follow or complete. The condition of notifying the probation officer of changes in employment was identified as being the least difficult to comply or complete,

while having one's driver's license suspended or revoked was identified as being the condition most difficult to comply with or complete. Probationers identified a condition as being *not difficult* if the condition did not require a lot of time or effort to complete, there was flexibility as to when they were able to complete the condition and if they financially could afford condition. Conditions were classified as being *very difficult* to adhere to or complete if the conditions interfered with the probationers' employment, relationships and/or other aspects of their lives, if the conditions restricted them from committing behaviors they enjoyed doing or did on a regular basis and if the probationers were not able to financially afford to pay the conditions. Overall, the perceived difficulty of probationers' probation sentences and probation conditions were mainly determined by the perceived severity of the conditions and their current financial situations.

Besides answering the question "what are probationers' perceptions of their conditions of probation?" by examining probationers' perceptions of the severity and difficulty of probation, the question was also answered by examining possible obstacles probationers are facing or will face. I answered the sub-research question "what do probationers see as potential obstacles that would hinder them from completing or adhering to the conditions of their probation?" by examining both quantitative and qualitative data. More probationers identified the obstacles listed in the interview instrument as not being obstacles for them successfully completing probation than identified them as being obstacles. Avoiding using drugs was the least likely obstacle, while finding a good job was perceived as being the greatest obstacle. Being able to financially afford all the financial obligations, completing the community service hours,

finding transportation to various probation conditions' locations, avoiding alcohol and/or drugs amongst those who drank and/or used, avoiding particular people, places and things and current health conditions were identified as being potential obstacle by the probationers who stated they were currently facing an obstacle or could potentially be facing an obstacle that could prevent them from successfully completing probation.

Comparison of Current Results to Previous Research

The only researchers that focused specifically on the perceptions of probation conditions have been Petersilia and Deschenes (1994a, 1994b). They had forty-eight male inmates rate how hard it would be for them to comply with thirteen different probation conditions. Petersilia and Deschenes (1994b) concluded that the inmates perceived that they would have little difficulty complying with the conditions. The current study supported their conclusions and produced similar results. With a few exceptions, the majority of probation conditions included in the interview instrument were identified by the probationers as being *not difficult* or *relatively easy* to comply with or complete.

In Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) study, there were limited significant differences between the inmates who indicated that the conditions of probation would be easy to comply with or complete and those who indicated the conditions as being difficult to comply with or complete. In their study, the race, marital status, parental status, employment history, prior prison experience and perceived safety of inmates were not significantly related to their perceptions of probation difficulty. The only significant difference was between those inmates with no history of drug or alcohol use and those who had used, with those with no history being more likely to report that they would find it difficult to attend a weekly outpatient treatment program.

The current study had similar findings to Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) findings. When I ran regressions there were a limited amount of differences between those who reported conditions as being easy to comply with and those who reported conditions as being more difficult. *Gender* was the only personal characteristics demographic that was a significant predictor for multiple difficulty scales. Women were more likely to report that paying the financial conditions, completing work crew days and jail sentences and allowing probation officers to visit their homes and employment sites as being more difficult to adhere or complete than men. Petersilia and Deschenes (1994b) only surveyed men and therefore, did not incorporate gender in their analysis. Though *race* was not a significant predictor in Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) study, *race* was a predictor for some of the probation conditions in this study. Non-White probationers were more likely to report the conditions of answering truthfully to inquiries by a probation officer, having to submit to random screens, and completing community service hours as being difficult to comply with or complete than White probationers.

As was the case in the Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) study, *marital status*, *parental status*, and *employment* were not significantly related to the probationers' perceptions of probation difficulty. Due a limited number of individuals reporting prior prison experience, a prior prison experience variable was not included in the analysis. However, prior prison experiences were incorporated in the *prior sentence history* variable (Independent Variable section). The *prior sentence history* variable, as well as five other previous criminal history variables, was not a significant predictor of perceived condition difficulty. A variable measuring the perceived safety of the individual was not included since my sample was composed of probationers versus currently incarcerated

inmates. Additionally, this study did not include questions pertaining to the probationers' use of drugs or alcohol so I was unable to include that variable. Nevertheless, the majority of Petersilia and Deschenes' variables were included and this study had similar results to Petersilia and Deschenes' results.

Petersilia and Deschenes (1994a, 1994b) did not ask about severity and difficulty separately. However, in an effort to make a clear distinction between severity and difficulty, probationers interviewed for this study were first asked about their perceptions of the probation conditions' severity and then the perceived levels of difficulty of the probation conditions. In addition to *gender*, probationers' perceptions of severity was a significant predictor for multiple difficulty scales and variables. Probationers who perceived probation conditions to be more severe were more likely to identify probation conditions as being difficult to follow or complete in comparison to those who perceived the probation conditions as being *not severe*.

With the literature examining perceptions of probation being so limited, I also examined the literature that focused on perceptions of the severity of different types of criminal sanctions. Previous literature suggests that offenders' experiences with the criminal justice system, as well as their personal characteristics, influences their perceptions of the punitiveness or severity of criminal sanctions (May & Wood, 2010). Though the support is limited, this study offers some support for previous research. This study's results suggest that some of the probationers' personal demographic characteristics, previous criminal history characteristics and current offense and probation sentence characteristics influence probationers' perceptions of severity of probation conditions, as well as their perceptions of potential obstacles.

In previous research, the offender's race has been a predictor of perceptions of the punitiveness and severity of criminal sanctions, with Blacks being more likely to view alternative sanctions as being more punitive than Whites (May & Wood, 2010; Wood & May, 2003). In this study, *race* was a predictor for some conditions' severity. In terms of perceptions of probation conditions' severity, race was a significant predictor for a severity scale. Non-Whites were more likely to report that the conditions of committing no new law violation, reporting to probation once a month, answering truthfully to all inquiries by probation officer, and notifying the probation officer of changes in residence and/or employment as being severe than White participants.

Significant differences between women and men suggest that perception of severity vary based on gender, with women typically being more willing to participate in alternative sanctions than men (May et al., 2005; Wood & Grasmick, 1999; Wood et al., 2005). In this study there were differences based on gender when it came to particular conditions. Women were more likely to indicate that paying the monthly cost of supervision and court costs as being severe than the male probationers.

Previous research also suggests that there are differences associated with age; older offenders typically report alternative sanctions to be more severe than younger offenders (Crouch, 1993; May et al., 2005; May & Wood, 2010; Spelman, 1995; Wood et al., 2005). The results from this study provide limited support for previous findings. In the case of probation conditions, as a person's age increased, the likelihood of the person indicating certain probation conditions as being severe decreased. The younger probationers were more likely to find the probation conditions included the interview instrument to be more severe than older probationers. Those conditions were typical

standard and treatment conditions. Age was also a significant predictor of agreement with potential obstacles. Younger probationers were more likely to identify finding a job, finding a good job, maintaining a residence, avoiding alcohol and/or drugs, their level of family support and their neighborhood conditions as potential obstacles for them successfully completing their sentence of probation than were older probationers. Age was a significant predictor of perceptions of severity and perceiving items as being obstacles more so than any other demographic.

Prior research has established that offenders' education level influences severity. Offenders with higher levels of education considered incarceration as being more severe than probation compared to individuals reporting lower levels of education (Crouch, 1993). In this study as the self-reported education level increased so did the likelihood of probationers reporting that the conditions of probationer officers visiting their homes and employment sites as severe.

Individuals with more exposure or experience with the criminal justice system, including prison experience, hold different preferences and beliefs about severity. Generally, they views of prison sentences as being less severe and alternative sanctions as being more severe than individuals with less exposure or experience with the criminal justice system (Crouch 1993; May et al., 2005; May & Wood, 2010; McClelland & Alpert, 1985). The results from this study offer support for prior findings, since probationers' criminal histories influenced their perceptions of probation. Individuals who had received a new law violation during the course of their current probation sentences were more likely to report paying the monthly cost of supervision and the court costs to be severe than those who had not violated. Additionally, the

probationers who had received multiple criminal sanctions (i.e., probation, jail and prison) were more likely to report that participating in and completing certain treatment programs and victim-based probation conditions as being severe than those with less extensive criminal sanctions experience.

Overall, there were few significant predictors of probationers' perception of severity and difficulty. This study lends limited support to Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) findings, in which only one predictor was identified. Additionally, this study lends limited support to prior research that identified race, gender, age, years of education and prior criminal justice experience as predictors of offenders' perception of severity (Crouch 1993; May et al., 2005; May & Wood, 2010; McClelland & Alpert, 1985; Spelman, 1995; Wood & May, 2003; Wood & Grasmick, 1999; Wood et al., 2005). However, none of the personal characteristics demographics, prior criminal justice experience demographics or current sentence and probation characteristics were significant predictors for all the probationers' perceptions of condition severity, condition difficulty or potential obstacles. This study contributes to the previous research that suggests that the relationship between offenders and perceived punitiveness or severity is complex.

Study Limitations

Though this study did contribute to the field since was the first to examine probationers' perceptions of probation, there were some limitations to the study. There were limitations associated with the study that limited the study's generalizability. Despite using multiple strategies to recruit participants, I only interviewed 202 probationers. Additionally, the study was originally designed to have random sample but in an effort to increase the sample size I included probationers who were

conveniently sampled. The small sample size and the inclusive of the convenience sample may have limited the study's generalizability.

The study is also limited because the entire sample was recruited from one probation agency. Since all of the 202 participants were being monitored by Alachua County Probation, the ability for the study's results to be generalized to other probation agencies is limited. It is possible that probationers' perception of probation may vary based on the agencies, the probation officers' employed by the agencies and the emphasis of the agencies (i.e., service-oriented, surveillance-oriented or service and surveillance-oriented). Furthermore, the probation conditions given by the probation agencies and court may vary, which may impact the probationers' perceptions of probation conditions.

In addition to all the participants being under the supervision of one agency, the participants were also all misdemeanor probationers¹. Though research about misdemeanor probation is needed, slightly more than half of all probationers (N= 1,665,216; 51%) on probation are there for a felony (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010). This study does shed light on probationers' perceptions of probation but the results might be limited in their ability to be applied to felony probationers. Felony probationers may have more conditions to adhere to or complete and/or different types of probation conditions (e.g., more punitive conditions, more standard conditions) which may influence the probationers' perception of severity and difficulty of the conditions.

¹ Some probationers were also serving a probation sentence for a felony conviction (which is supervised by the Florida Department of Corrections), but they were asked to only discuss their misdemeanor probation.

There were also limitations associated with recruiting participants (Appendix A). Of the originally randomly sampled 450 probationers, I was not able to have direct contact with thirty-two probationers (6.2%), while another seven probationers (1.4%) failed to report to the probation agency during the entire course of the study. One hundred and fourteen probationers (22.1%) randomly sampled became ineligible to participate (e.g., violated, mail-in status, etc.) during the course of the study. Those who were not interviewed may have different perceptions of probation than those I interviewed. Additionally, the number of probationers interviewed from each particular probationer officer's caseload varied. Of the ten probation officers, five probation officers had over twenty but less than thirty probationers participate. Three probation officers had over ten but less than nineteen of their probationers participate. One probation officer had thirty-one probationers participate, while another only had seven probationers. It is possible that probationers' perceptions of probation may vary based on their probation officer. The willingness of the probation officers to assist the researchers in recruiting participants also varied which more than likely impacted which probationers participated in the study.

I also experienced some limitations while collecting the official data. Some records contained information pertaining to the person's juvenile criminal record. However, it is not clear whether the records that do not contain juvenile record information are actually an indication that the person does not have a juvenile record or an indication that this information simply missing from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and Florida Crime Information Center (FCIC) files I examined. Because of this problem, I was not able to include juvenile record information in the analysis.

Also, each state has a different format for reporting criminal history information. I recorded the presence of an out of state history, the state(s) where the history is from and as much additional information as possible but the states vary in how much information is included in the NCIC report. It is possible that I did not get a complete picture of some people's out of state criminal history because of the missing information. The NCIC/FCIC reports also did not include all the cases' dispositions, which limited my ability to accurately account for peoples' criminal sanction history. For example, I do not know about all the probation, jail and/or prison sentences received because they were not included in the criminal history report.

There were also differences in probation officers' record-keeping which limited my official data collection. Some probation officers did not maintain as complete records of their probationers' probation conditions as others. I was not able to collect as detailed information about their probationers as I was able to collect about probationers whose probation officers maintained more complete records. For example, some probation officers did not indicate whether their probationers were evaluated and referred to particular treatment programs (e.g., mental health, alcohol, drug, batterer's intervention, anger management, etc.). From the court records I was able to establish the person was assigned to be evaluated for programming but I was not always able to identify which program because the probation officer failed to record it in "Monitor," the case management software that maintains probationers' files. I also noted differences in reporting violation of probations. Some probation officers did not record all the violations and descriptions of the violations, while others provided detailed descriptions

of the violations. The differences in record-keeping among probation officers limited some of the data I was able to collect.

The study also had limitations stemming from the interview instrument. There were no questions that specifically asked probationers about their probationer officer or the probation agency. Their views of their probation officer may influence their perceptions about probation and the conditions. Additionally, their view of Alachua County Probation may influence their views on the severity and difficulty of their conditions of probation depending on what they feel the goal of the agency is. Based on Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) research, there was a question that asked probationers to rate the perceived difficulty of their probation sentence. However, a question asking probationers to rate the perceived severity of their probation sentence was not included. Though I created an *overall severity* variable by combining the individuals' rating of the probation conditions, a direct measure would have been preferred. I also did not include any questions that would allow me to examine probationers' perceptions of Procedural Justice. Procedural Justice measures would have allowed me to test whether probationers' perceptions of fairness influences how severe and difficult they perceive the conditions would be for them to adhere or complete.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future research should first address the limitations associated with the study. First, researchers should try to include more participants. Future studies should also sample probationers from multiple probation agencies in order to increase the ability to generalize the study's results. In addition to sampling probationers from multiple agencies, future research should sample felony probationers as well as misdemeanor

probationers. Including more participants, participants from various probation agencies and/or both felony and misdemeanor probationers would allow for greater generalizability and the ability to compare across groups.

Although we used multiple approaches to increase the sample size, researchers should try to incorporate other strategies for recruiting participants. Researchers may consider trying to reach probationers via social networks (e.g., Facebook, MySpace, etc.). They may also attempt to reach them through violation of probation court appearances or try to interview them while the probationers are housed in jail waiting for their violation of probation hearing. Researchers may also consider having an online survey for those who express concern or unwillingness to participate in an in-depth interview. The online survey would not allow all the information sought to be gathered that an in-depth interview would be able to gather but the majority of the information could be collected using that format.

Researchers may not have a lot of control of what is reported in FCIC/NCIC in terms of the presence of the juvenile history or cases' dispositions. However, they may be able to locate the original data. Researchers could access the particular state's court records or court case records and record the information missing from the FCIC/NCIC. Researchers may also attempt to obtain information missing from the probationers' files through other sources. Probation officers may keep relevant information in hardcopy form, which the researchers could use to fill in information missing from the probationers' electronic case file.

Future research should also try to include questions that measure probationers' views of their probationer officer and/or the probation agency. A question that asks

probationers to rate the perceived severity of their probation sentence should also be included in future studies. Additionally, in an effort to better explain individuals' perceptions, measures of Procedural Justice should be added. In this study, probationers were asked about thirty-two conditions of probation. Future research may include more or include probation conditions that are more relevant to the particular probation agencies being studied.

Previous research examined current inmates' views of probation, while this study examined current probationers' view of probation. Future research should extend beyond probation. Individuals required to adhere to or complete pretrial conditions should be asked about their pretrial conditions. Additionally, those on day reporting should be asked about their experiences with their day reporting conditions. Some of the criminal sanctions that are imposed may be thought of as punishment by criminal justice officials but not felt as a punishment by the offenders. There is limited research about offenders' perception of probation, and none about their views of pretrial and day reporting.

The final suggestion for future research is criminal justice system workers should be asked the same questions as the probationers. While previous researchers have asked criminal justice employees about their views about the severity and/or difficulty of various types of criminal sanctions, Petersilia and Deschenes (1994a) were the only ones to ask criminal justice workers about probation conditions. Prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges and probation officers should be asked to rate the severity and difficulty of the probation conditions. This would allow for a comparison between the groups and between the probationers. Prior researchers suggest that judges,

prosecutors, and defense attorneys do not always take great care when setting probation conditions or type of supervision (Clarke, 1979). By asking them about their perceptions it may shed light on why conditions are given to probationers. Though this study expanded the literature by building upon Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) study, there is still more research needed to more fully understand probationers' perceptions of probation.

Policy Implications

One of my goals for this study was to make policy recommendations. Despite, probation being the most commonly used sanction, there is little consensus about the actual function of probation and probation officers (Klockars, 1972). It is unclear whether probation sentences are meant to rehabilitate, punish or rehabilitate and punish (Blackmore, 1981; Czajkoski, 1965; Van Laningham et al., 1966), which makes it difficult to interpret probationers' perception of probation. If the mission of probation is to be punishment and the focus is on surveillance, this study suggests that most probationers do not consider the criminal sanction to be a severe punishment or a difficult punishment to comply or complete. If the mission of probation is to help and the focus is on providing services, probationers appear to identify some of the conditions as being helpful. Without probation's mission and purpose not being clear, it is difficult to judge probation conditions and whether they are being perceived as they should be probationers. This study strongly suggests that the field of Criminology and those who work within the criminal justice system define and state purpose of probation. This would allow the perceptions of probationers to be better interpreted and state whether the probation conditions are accomplishing their goals.

Assuming that probation is meant to be punitive, this study identified which conditions are viewed as being the most punitive. The condition of completing a jail sentence was one of the most punitive, while having one's driver's license suspended and/revoked was probation condition that was identified by the most probationers as being *extremely severe*. If the mission of probation is to be punitive, those assigning probation conditions may want to utilize the probation conditions of completing a jail sentence and suspending or revoking probationers' drivers licenses more often.

In terms of making policy recommendations that may help in reducing the likelihood of individuals violating the terms of their probation due to a technical violation, I identified which conditions were viewed as being the most difficult to adhere to and complete by current probationers (Table 8-2). The conditions of a jail sentence and driver's license being suspended or revoked are the conditions that were reported as being the most difficult to comply with or complete. In an effort to help their probationers avoid receiving a violation of probation, probation officers may consider helping probationers find alternative forms of transportation, such as helping them obtain monthly bus passes and ensuring their probationers are familiar with reading bus schedules. Probation officers may also consider helping probationers find adequate child care for their children while they are incarcerated and/or ways to ensure the probationers do not lose their jobs, both of which are difficulties that probationers may experience while incarcerated.

Table 8-2. Condition continuum based on *very difficult* responses percentages

Conditions	%	Condition Classification
Driver's license suspended/revoked	47.5	Punitive
Complete a jail sentence	42.1	Punitive
Abide with order of impoundment	29.3	Punitive
Pay court costs	24.1	Standard

Table 8-2. Continued

Conditions	%	Condition Classification
Abide by curfew	21.8	Punitive
Pay restitution	20.5	Punitive
Complete work crew days	19.7	Punitive
Pay monthly cost of supervision	17.6	Standard
Complete mandatory community service hours	13.4	Punitive
Complete community service hours in lieu of fees	13.3	Punitive
Try to obtain employment	12.0	Standard
Allow probation officer to visit employment site	10.9	Standard
Complete Batterer's Intervention	9.2	Treatment
No contact with victim	8.9	Punitive
Attend driver's course	7.3	Treatment
Participate in alcohol treatment	6.5	Treatment
Attend one victim impact panel	5.4	Punitive
Participate in mental health treatment	5.4	Treatment
Participate in drug treatment	5.3	Treatment
Maintain employment/enrollment	4.4	Standard
Complete Milepost class	4.1	Treatment
Participate in employment program	4.0	Treatment
Do not possess or consume alcohol	3.8	Treatment
Allow probation officer to visit residence	3.1	Standard
Do not possess or consume drugs	2.2	Treatment
Commit no new law violation	2.0	Standard
Submit to random screens	1.7	Treatment
Report to probation once a month	1.5	Standard
Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer	0.5	Standard
Notify probation officer of changes in residence	0.5	Standard
Notify probation officer of changes in employment	0.5	Standard

The qualitative data suggested that the financial obligations associated with probation are often obstacles for probationers. A more service-oriented stance to probation would suggest that probation officers should aid probationers in finding solutions for paying. The probation officers may consider helping probationers locate and secure employment, creating feasible payment plans and schedules and/or identifying non-financial payment solutions (e.g., community service hours, work crew days).

As part of the interview probationers were asked “is there anything that I have not asked you about conditions of probation or sanction severity that you feel I should know” (Question 301). I performed a content analysis on probationers’ responses and noted three policy recommendations recommended by probationers. The first policy recommendation was that the fees should be reduced. A thirty-three year-old, Black, male, violent offender stated “less money to pay,” while a twenty-one year-old, White, female, public order offender shared “a little bit less of fines, like lower the fines.” The second policy recommendation made by probationers was that probationers should be required to complete more treatment programs. “I would recommend family counseling or even just counseling for individuals” was a comment made by a thirty year-old, White, male, violent offender when he was asked the question. A thirty-five year-old, White, male, violent offender said “more programs to help” when he was asked the same question.

The final recommendation made by the probationers was that probation’s reporting practices should be more lax. “Doing probation through mail, not having to report in an office every month” was reported by a thirty-five year-old, Black, female, public order offender and highlighted this recommendation the best. While I have recommended that there is a desperate need to define probation’s mission, conditions if the goal of probation is to punish, and some strategies to aid probationers if the goal of probation is to be service-oriented, probationers’ mainly recommended ways to make probation less difficult for them, either through reducing fees or reporting requirements. The recommendation of adding more treatment conditions suggested that probationers feel the mission of probation should be more treatment-oriented than surveillance-oriented.

Chapter Summary

This study offered an examination into probation conditions and probationers' perceptions of conditions' severity and difficulty and their perceptions of potential obstacles for successfully completing probation. Probation conditions do fall within a continuum in terms of severity and probationers' perceptions of their conditions of probation are that probation conditions are typically *not severe*. Additionally, probationers do consider the perceived severity of probation conditions when identifying the perceived difficulty of complying or adhering to probation conditions, though the majority of probation conditions were perceived as being *not difficult*. The majority of listed obstacles were not viewed as obstacles by the probationers for them successfully completing their probation sentences; this study identified six common obstacles. This study had similar results as Petersilia and Deschenes' (1994b) study, which my study builds upon by sampling current probationers and including more conditions of probation. This study also lends limited support for some of the predictors of offenders' perceptions of criminal sanctions identified in previous research. Policy suggestions were made following a discussion of the study's limitations and recommendations for future research. This study only started the examination and exploration into the probationers' perception of probation, and considering probation is the most imposed criminal justice sanction within the United States, much more research is needed.

APPENDIX A
NOT INTERVIEWED CLASSIFICATION

Of the 517 individuals comprising the total sample, 315 individuals were not interviewed. They were not interviewed for various reasons and were categorized into seven groups based on those reasons (Table A-1). The first group of those who were not interviewed was called the “no-show” group. This group was composed seventy-nine individuals who set up an interview and then failed to show up for their scheduled interview. Additionally these individuals did not call to cancel their interviews or respond to the researcher’s attempts to reschedule their original appointment. The second group, “will contact” group, was composed of individuals who had direct contact with the researcher and stated that he or she would either call or email the researcher to set up an interview but never did. There were eight individuals who agreed to participate but failed to contact the researcher for an interview time. Ten individuals agreed to participate, set up an interview but then cancelled their interview. Typically,

Table A-1. Sample classifications

	N	%
Interviewed	202	39.1
Not Interviewed		
No show	79	15.3
Will contact	8	1.5
Cancelled	10	1.9
No direct contact	32	6.2
Failed to report	7	1.4
Refused		
No interest	47	9.1
Done with both incentives	18	3.5
Ineligible		
Violated	63	12.2
End of sentence	9	1.7
Early termination	17	3.3
Mail-in status	20	3.9
Administrative	5	1.0
Total sample	517	100

individuals would cancel during the reminder call and did not set up another interview time. This group was called “cancelled” group.

Thirty-two of the originally sampled individuals reported throughout the course of the study but I was unable to connect with them directly. In most cases, the probationer did not report during his or her designated times and came during times when I was either not there or was not anticipating him or her and therefore not looking for the person. Other times I missed the person due to the high volume of individuals reporting at the same time. These individuals should still have received three letters describing the study, one mailed to their homes and two from their probation officers. The group of thirty-two individuals was called the “no direct contact” group. The “failed to report” group was composed of seven individuals who failed to report to the Court Services building during the months the study was being conducted. Though these individuals did not report to probation during the five months data were being collected, no violation reports were written. Since letters describing the study were mailed to their home addresses, the individuals in this group may still have been aware of the study, except in one case where the letter was returned as undelivered. I was never given the opportunity to make direct contact with the people in the “failed to report” group.

Sixty-five of the probationers with whom I had direct contact refused to participate in the study. If the person indicated he or she was not interested because he or she had completed both incentives given for participating in the study, (s)he was classified in the “refused- done with both incentives” group. Eighteen of the sixty-five people who refused were placed in this category. The remaining forty-seven individuals were placed in the “refused- no interest” group.

The largest group comprising those who were not interviewed was the ineligible group, which was divided into five subgroups. Sixty-three individuals were categorized in the “ineligible- violated” group because they violated the conditions of their probation during the course of the study. Nine probationers completed their probation during the course of the study and were placed in the “ineligible- end of sentence” group. This classification indicated the person completed his or her entire probation sentence. An additional seventeen individuals were grouped into the “ineligible- early termination” group. This indicated that their probation term ended early due to their good behavior and that they had successfully completed the conditions of their probation early than scheduled.

One of the study criteria was that the person was required to report monthly to the probation office. During the course of the study twenty individuals were moved to mail-in status, which allowed them to mail their monthly status report to the probation office and did not require them to report in-person to the probation office. These individuals were placed in the “ineligible- mail-in status” group. The final group, “ineligible- administrative” group, was composed of five people. This group was made up in individuals who during the course of the data collection process had their probation sentence stayed, their probation sentence moved to another county and in two cases the people were admitted to a mental health facility and probation terminated. In all five cases, the people no longer met the sample criteria for the study.

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO PROBATIONERS



UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA

Division of Criminology, Law, & Society
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

3323 Turlington Hall, P. O. Box 117330
Gainesville, FL 32611-7330
(352) 392-0265 TEL
(352) 392-6568, FAX

Dear Mr. /Ms.,

We are Saskia Santos and Katheryn Zambrana, and we are currently students at the University of Florida's Criminology, Law and Society Graduate Program. We are inviting you to participate in an independent research study that is trying to understand probationers' views of the terms and conditions they are required to complete, as well as issues surrounding fear of crime and the community. Specifically, we would like to see what you think of the conditions of your probation and how you view crime.

This study is completely separate from Court Services and probation staff. Participation is voluntary, so if you decide not to take part in the study it will NOT affect your probation status. If you do decide to participate, you have the right to stop at any time with no consequences. You can also choose to only respond to those questions that you want to. There is no cash incentive for participating. However, if you choose to participate you are eligible to receive **5 hours of community service credit**. Those who are not required to complete community service hours will be eligible for **1 month cost of supervision credit**. You are only eligible for one of the credit options.

If you agree to be in this study, there are two options for setting up an interview:
Scheduling with us via telephone or e-mail, which is listed below
Signing up in person on the day you report to Court Services

If you choose to wait to schedule an interview until the day that you report, we will be available during that time to answer any questions that you have and to try to set up an interview with you. The interview should last about one hour. During the interview we will ask questions, some of which will be digital-recorded, in order to better understand your experiences with being on probation and a member of the community. Your answers will be confidential and private. Only the researchers know what you said.

Please feel free to contact us via phone or e-mail. Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to hearing from you!

Please Contact *Either*:

Saskia Santos,
Cell: 352 278-4728
Email: saskial@ufl.edu

Katheryn Zambrana
Cell: 352 278-4728
Email: kzambrana@ufl.edu

Supervisor: Jodi Lane, Ph.D.
University of Florida
P.O. Box 117330
Gainesville, FL 32611
352 392-0265 ext. 212

Sincerely,
Saskia Santos

Katheryn Zambrana

APPENDIX C
FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PROBATIONERS



UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA

Division of Criminology, Law, & Society
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

3323 Turlington Hall, P. O. Box 117330
Gainesville, FL 32611-7330
(352) 392-0265 TEL
(352) 392-6568 FAX

Dear Mr. /Ms. TYPE IN NAME,

We are Saskia Santos and Katheryn Zambrana, current University of Florida students in the Criminology, Law and Society Graduate Program. We invite you to participate in an independent research study. We want to understand how probationers view the terms and conditions of their probation, as well as hear their views on fear of crime and community issues. Specifically, we would like you to tell us your thoughts on the terms and conditions of your probation and to share with us your views of crime.

This study is completely separate from Court Services and the probation staff. Participation is voluntary; so, if you decide not to take part in the study, it will NOT affect your probation status. There is no cash incentive for participating. However, if you choose to participate you are eligible to receive **5 hours of community service credit**. If you are not required to complete community service hours, you will be eligible for **1 month cost of supervision credit**. You are only eligible for one of these credit options.

If you would like to set up an interview please contact either:

Saskia Santos
Cell: 352 278-4728
Email: saskia1@ufl.edu

Katheryn Zambrana
Cell: 352 278-4728
Email: kzambrana@ufl.edu

Supervisor: Jodi Lane, Ph.D.
352 392-0265 ext. 212

The interview should last about one hour. During the interview we will ask questions, some of which will be tape-recorded, in order to better understand your experiences with being on probation and as a member of the community. Your answers will be confidential and private. Only the researchers will know what you said.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact us via phone or e-mail. Thank you. We look forward to hearing from you!

Approved by
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02
Protocol # 2010-U-0347
For Use Through 05-13-2011

Sincerely,
Saskia Santos

Katheryn Zambrana

APPENDIX D
CRIMINAL HISTORY FORM

Criminal History Form Cover Sheet

Probationer's Name: _____

Note: Upon completing this form please remove this cover page from the criminal history form and place it in the designated envelope

1. Subject Number: _____ **Criminal History Form** 2. Researcher (enter name): _____
 3. Criminal history retrieved: _____ (mm/dd/yy) 4. Criminal history form completed: _____ (mm/dd/yy)
 5. Date of birth: _____ (mm/dd/yy) 6. Sex (circle one): Male 1 Female 0
 7. Race (circle one): White 1 Black/African American 2 Other Specify _____

Criminal history: Use additional form if more space is needed

Offense: copy verbatim each offense in the order it appears on the criminal record	a. Degree: list if 1,2,3 degree and M if misdemeanor and F if felony	b. State: list state where occurred	c. Case number (number cases in order)	d. Date arrested	e. Outcome: code 1=probation, 2= jail days, 3= prison time, 4= case dropped, 5= other	f. Details: if outcome was: 1 or 3= list sentence in mos, 2= list days, 5= specify other
8. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Current Offense: Circle yes or no and complete column a	Yes	No	Case number(s): if yes, list case number
17. Possession of marijuana- not more than 20 grams	1	0	_____
18. Alcohol possession by person under 21 years of age	1	0	_____
19. Driving under the influence of alcohol	1	0	_____
20. Driving while license suspended or revoked	1	0	_____
21. No valid driver's license	1	0	_____
22. Criminal mischief over 200 dollars under 1000 dollars	1	0	_____
23. Larceny: petit first degree property 100 to under 300 dollars	1	0	_____
24. Retail theft	1	0	_____
25. Worthless check	1	0	_____
26. Trespass	1	0	_____
27. Resisting or obstruct officer without violence	1	0	_____
28. Battery: touch or strike	1	0	_____
29. Domestic battery: touch or strike	1	0	_____
30. Other (specify _____)	1	0	_____

Current Offense: Circle yes or no and complete column a	Yes	No	Case number(s): if yes, list case number
31. Other (specify _____)	1	0	_____
32. Other (specify _____)	1	0	_____
33. Other (specify _____)	1	0	_____
34. Other (specify _____)	1	0	_____
35. Length of current probation sentence: _____ months			
36. Expected probation termination date: _____ (mm/dd/yy)			

New law violation: copy verbatim the offense in order offense occurred and complete columns a, b and c	a. Date: list date of offense by mm/dd/yy	b. Outcome: code 1=extended sentence, 2= additional condition(s), 3=days in jail, 4=other	c. Details: if outcome was: 1= list term, if 2= list condition, if 3= how many days, if 4= specify other
37. _____	_____	_____	_____
38. _____	_____	_____	_____
39. _____	_____	_____	_____
40. _____	_____	_____	_____
41. _____	_____	_____	_____
42. _____	_____	_____	_____
43. _____	_____	_____	_____

Types of technical violations: if technical violation occurred complete columns a, b and c	Number of violations: indicate number	b. Outcome: code 1=extended sentence, 2= condition(s), 3=days in jail, 4= other	c. Details: if outcome was: 1= list term, if 2= list condition, if 3= how many days, if 4= specify other
44. Report to probation office once a month	_____	_____	_____
45. Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	_____	_____	_____
46. Notify PO of changes in residence	_____	_____	_____
47. Notify PO of changes employment/education	_____	_____	_____
48. Try to obtain employment	_____	_____	_____
49. Maintain employment/school enrollment	_____	_____	_____
50. Allow PO to visit residence	_____	_____	_____
51. Allow PO to visit employment site	_____	_____	_____
52. Pay monthly cost of supervision	_____	_____	_____
53. Pay court cost	_____	_____	_____
54. Complete community service (CS) hours in lieu of fees	_____	_____	_____
55. Complete mandatory CS hours	_____	_____	_____
56. Complete work crew days	_____	_____	_____
57. Complete a jail sentence	_____	_____	_____

Types of technical violations: if technical violation occurred complete columns a, b and c

Number of violations: indicate number

b. Outcome: code 1=extended sentence, 2= condition(s), 3=days in jail, 4= other

c. Details: if outcome was: 1= list term, if 2= list condition, if 3= how many days, if 4= specify other

58. Pay restitution	_____	_____	_____
59. Submit to random screens (breathalyzer/urinalysis)	_____	_____	_____
60. Do not possess or consume alcohol	_____	_____	_____
61. Do not possess or consume illegal drugs	_____	_____	_____
62. Participate in alcohol treatment	_____	_____	_____
63. Participate in drug treatment	_____	_____	_____
64. Participate in mental health treatment	_____	_____	_____
65. Participate in employment program	_____	_____	_____
66. Complete Milepost class	_____	_____	_____
67. Complete DART program	_____	_____	_____
68. Complete Batterer's Intervention program	_____	_____	_____
69. Complete anger management	_____	_____	_____
70. No contact with victim	_____	_____	_____
71. Attend alcohol safety education school	_____	_____	_____
72. Attend 1 victim impact panel	_____	_____	_____
73. Driver's license (DL) suspended/revoked	_____	_____	_____
74. Abide with order of impoundment	_____	_____	_____
75. Abide by curfew	_____	_____	_____
76. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
77. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
78. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
79. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
80. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____

Probation conditions: circle one and specify where applicable

	Yes	Specify	No
81. Commit no new law violation	1		0
82. Report to probation office once a month	1		0
83. Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer	1		0
84. Notify PO of changes in residence	1		0
85. Notify PO of changes in employment/education	1		0
86. Try to obtain employment	1		0
87. Maintain employment/school enrollment	1		0

Probation conditions: circle one and specify where applicable	Yes	Specify	No
88. Allow PO to visit residence	1		0
89. Allow PO to visit employment site	1		0
90. Pay monthly cost of supervision (specify amount)	1	\$ _____	0
91. Pay court cost (specify amount)	1	\$ _____	0
92. Complete CS hours in lieu of fees (specify hours)	1	_____ hrs	0
93. Complete mandatory CS hours (specify hours)	1	_____ hrs	0
94. Complete work crew days (specify days)	1	_____ days	0
95. Complete a jail sentence (specify days)	1	_____ days	0
96. Pay restitution (specify amount)	1	\$ _____	0
97. Submit to random screens (breathalyzer and urinalysis)	1		0
98. Do not possess or consume alcohol	1		0
99. Do not possess or consume illegal drugs	1		0
100. Participate in alcohol treatment	1		0
101. Participate in drug treatment	1		0
102. Participate in mental health treatment	1		0
103. Participate in employment program	1		0
104. Complete Milepost class	1		0
105. Complete DART program	1		0
106. Complete Batterer's Intervention program	1		0
107. Complete anger management	1		0
108. No contact with victim	1		0
109. Attend alcohol safety education school	1		0
110. Attend 1 victim impact panel	1		0
111. Driver's license (DL) suspended/revoked (specify months)	1	_____ mos	0
112. Abide with order of impoundment	1		0
113. Abide by curfew	1		0
114. Other (specify _____)	1		0
115. Other (specify _____)	1		0
116. Other (specify _____)	1		0
117. Other (specify _____)	1		0
118. Other (specify _____)	1		0

APPENDIX E INFORMED CONSENT

Title: An in-depth study of supervised probationers in Alachua County

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in the study.

Purpose of the research study:

We are Saskia Santos and Katheryn Zambrana and we are currently students in the University of Florida's Criminology, Law and Society Graduate Program. We are working on a project that hopes to examine probationers' opinions about their probation experience and their community experience, specifically factors related to fear of crime.

What you will be asked to do in the study:

You will be asked to answer a series of questions about your experiences with being on probation, your fear of crime and your community. For most of the questions, the researcher will present you with a card with the answer options and you will be asked to pick which option best fits your answer. The researcher will then record the option you selected on the survey. For some of the questions, the researcher will ask whether you are willing to have your responses tape recorded. Unless you object, when the researcher comes to such a question, the researcher will turn on the digital-recorder, ask the question, and turn off the digital-recorder once you have finished responding. Please note that during the interview the researcher will not place your name or anything that could be used to figure out who you are on the survey. You are asked to please not say your name/nickname or talk about specific things that could be used to identify you or anyone else while you are being digital-recorded. If you do say anything that can be used to identify you, it will be left out during transcription. Please remember that there are no "right" answers. The researchers are interested in understanding *your* views on probation and probation conditions, as well as gain insight into your fear of crime and community.

If you agree to let us interview you, please sign this consent form and return it to the researcher.

Time required:

It should take between about 45 minutes to an hour but could be longer depending on your pace.

Benefits:

You will not be paid for participating in the interview. However, if you do participate you are eligible to receive **5 hours of community service credit**. Those who are not required to complete community service hours will be eligible for **1 month cost of supervision credit**. You are only eligible for one of the credit options.

Risks and confidentiality:

Taking part in study creates little risk to you. Your responses will be kept private to the extent provided by law. The researchers in this study are not associated with Court Services or probation staff. No one other than those working on this study will know your responses. We will not put your name or other identifiers on any of the responses

you give. Rather, the survey will have a subject number attached to it. We will keep a list of names and subject numbers separate to make sure that if someone reads your survey answers, he or she would not be able to determine that they are yours. Your answers that are recorded will be transcribed using only the subject number and any identifying information recorded (e.g., names) will be left out of the transcription. The tapes will be transcribed word for word within 40 days; the tapes will then be destroyed/erased so your voice cannot be recognized later. There will be no link between your name and your survey responses; so not even the researchers will be able to tell who said what. Your name will not be used in any report. Instead, we will only report answers for the group as a whole (for example, how individuals answered in each response category).

Voluntary participation:

You do not have to answer the questions or be recorded. Your participation is completely voluntary. Nothing will happen if you do not want to join the study; it will not affect your probation status.

Right to withdraw from the study:

You have the right to leave the study and stop the interview at any time. You can answer some questions and not answer other questions.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

Saskia Santos, M.A., Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law, 3323 Turlington Hall, P.O. Box 117330, Gainesville, FL 32611-7330, phone-(352) 278-4728, fax-(352) 392-6568, email- saskia1@ufl.edu

Katheryn Zambrana, Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law, 3323 Turlington Hall, P.O. Box 117330, Gainesville, FL 32611-7330, phone- (352) 278-4728, fax-(352) 392-6568, email- kzambrana@ufl.edu

Jodi Lane, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law, 3323 Turlington Hall, P.O. Box 117330, Gainesville, FL 32611-7330, phone-(352) 392-0265 x212, fax-(352) 392-6568, email- jlane@ufl.edu

Whom to contact about you rights as a research participant in this study:

If you have questions about being involved in this research, you may contact: UFIRB Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250, telephone- (352) 392-0433

Agreement:

I have read this consent form. I voluntarily **AGREE** to answer the questions for this study and I have received a copy of this form.

Sign your name above if you agree to participate

Date

Print your name above

Principle investigator

Date

APPENDIX F PROTECTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Since the study used human subjects, I took certain measures and precautions to protect the participants of the study and ensure that their responses remained confidential. The interviews were not conducted in a location where the conversation could be overheard by individuals outside of the research project. In the cases when there was not enough privacy, the person was asked to complete the survey by filling in the responses on his or her own. None of the information obtained from study participants was made available to anyone outside this research project.

I took precautions to minimize the risk of others linking a participant to his or her responses and used a subject number on the participant's interview instrument and interview tapes and transcriptions. The list of participants with their subject number that linked the informed consent, criminal history form and the interview instrument together was kept password protected. The list was kept separate from all study material that contained participants' responses. No personal identifying information, such as court case numbers, was collected on the interview instrument. The recordings used during the interviews were erased following transcription, which occurred within forty-five days of the interview. All identifying information recorded during the interview (e.g., names, nicknames) was removed from the transcripts. The undergraduate research assistants that were assigned to transcribe the interviews were required to sign a letter of confidentiality. The research assistants were never provided with the names of individuals participating in the study. They only received a recording with the participant's subject number.

No identifiers were kept in the data file that could tie the participants to their responses and instead responses were coded in data files using the participants' subject number. The researchers were certified through Florida Department of Law Enforcement on the proper handling criminal histories and were legally bound to the confidentiality agreement entered upon certification. The emails sent to the probation officers with the names of the probationers' eligible to receive credit for participating never indicated whether the participants completed the interview or any of the participants' responses. The informed consent form, which the probationers were required to sign in order to participate, informed them of their rights as a participant and who to contact if they had any questions regarding the study.

APPENDIX G
INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

**AN IN-DEPTH STUDY OF SUPERVISED PROBATIONERS IN ALACHUA
COUNTY**

TO BE COMPLETED BY INTERVIEWER:

Interview Number:			
Probationer's Name:			
Consent Date: (dd/mm/yy)			
Date of Interview: (dd/mm/yy)			
Location of Interview:			
Interviewer Name:			
Time Interview Began:		AM	PM
Time Interview Ended:		AM	PM
Date Criminal History Retrieved: (dd/mm/yy)			
Date Criminal History Form Completed: (dd/mm/yy)			

Please use the extra sheets of paper provided for any additional notes if the space provided on the instrument is not enough. When taking notes be sure to indicate the question number.

Read] First, I am going to ask you some questions about you.

1. How long have you lived in your neighborhood? _____ (circle: days, mos, yrs)								
2. What type of place do you live in? (Read options & circle one) (Ferraro, 1995)	Single family house 1	An apartment 2	A duplex 3	A condominium 4	A trailer house 5			
	A rooming house 6		Other Specify _____			DK 98	RF 99	
3. How would you define your neighborhood? Is it... (Read options & circle one) (Lane, et al., 1997)	The block you live on 1	The blocks around your home 2	Your housing development 3					
	A section of your city 4	Your county 5	Other Specify _____			DK 98	RF 99	
4. How long have you lived at your current residence? (enter number and circle)								DK 98
								RF 99
5. How many people live in your household? (enter number)								DK 98
								RF 99
6. Do you have children? (circle one) (If no, skip to #9)	Yes 1	No 0		DK 98				RF 99
7. How many children do you have? (enter number)				DK 98				RF 99
8. Do your children (or child) live with you? (circle one)	Yes 1	No 0		DK 98				RF 99
9. What is your current marital status? (circle one) (do not read answer options)	Married 1	Widowed 2	Divorced 3	Separated 4	Never married 5	Living with a partner 6		DK 98
								RF 99
10. How would you describe your race? (circle one) (do not read answer options)	White 1	Black/African American 2		Other Specify _____				DK 98
								RF 99
11. How would you describe your ethnicity? (circle one) (do not read answer options)		Hispanic 1			Non-Hispanic 0			DK 98
								RF 99
12. What is your current employment status? (circle one) (do not read answer options)	Full-time 1	Part-time 2	Not employed 3		Other Specify _____			DK 98
								RF 99

13. What is highest level of education you have obtained? (circle one) (do not read answer options)	9 th Grade 9	10 th grade 10	11 th grade 11	High school 12	GED 13		
	Some college 14	Other	Specify _____			DK 98	RF 99

[Read] Now I am going to ask you some questions about you being on probation

14. How long is your probation sentence? (enter number)	_____mos	DK 98	RF 99
--	----------	----------	----------

15. How much of your probation sentence have you served? (enter number)	_____mos	DK 98	RF 99
---	----------	----------	----------

16. Did you receive probation as the result of a plea agreement? (circle one)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99
---	----------	---------	----------	----------

What are the charge(s) that you are serving probation for? (circle yes or no) (do not read answer options)		Yes	No
17. Possession or use of drug paraphernalia		1	0
18. Possession or use of narcotic equipment		1	0
19. Possession of marijuana- not more than 20 grams		1	0
20. Alcohol possession by person under 21 years of age		1	0
21. Driving under the influence of alcohol		1	0
22. Driving while license suspended or revoked		1	0
23. No valid driver's license		1	0
24. Criminal mischief over 200 dollars under 1000 dollars		1	0
25. Larceny: petit first degree property 100 to under 300 dollars		1	0
26. Retail theft		1	0
27. Worthless check		1	0
28. Trespass		1	0
29. Resisting or obstruct officer without violence		1	0
30. Battery: touch or strike		1	0
31. Domestic battery: touch or strike		1	0
32. Other (specify _____)		1	0
33. Other (specify _____)		1	0
34. Other (specify _____)		1	0
35. Other (specify _____)		1	0

36. Have you received any violations for this sentence? (circle one) (If no, skip to #82)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99
Was the violation a new law violation? (If yes, list verbatim the offense in the order the offense occurred and complete columns a, b and c) (If no, skip to #44) Date (indicate the date that the offense by mm/dd/yy). Outcome (code the outcome of the violation: 1= extended probation sentence, 2= additional condition(s), 3= days in jail, 4= other) Details (explain each condition. If 1- list new term, if 2- list new condition, if 3- how many days, if 4- specify other)				
37. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
38. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
39. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
40. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
41. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
42. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
43. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Was the violation a technical violation? (If yes, list verbatim the offense in the order the offense occurred and complete columns a, b and c) (do not read answer options) (If no, skip to #82) Number of times it occurred (indicate number) Outcome (code outcome of the violation: 1= extended probation sentence, 2= additional condition(s), 3= days in jail, 4= other) Details (explain each condition. If 1- list new term, if 2- list new condition, if 3- how many days, if 4- specify other)				
44. Report to probation office once a month	_____	_____	_____	_____
45. Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer	_____	_____	_____	_____
46. Notify PO of changes in your residence	_____	_____	_____	_____
47. Notify PO of changes in your employment/education	_____	_____	_____	_____
48. Try to obtain employment	_____	_____	_____	_____
49. Maintain employment/school enrollment	_____	_____	_____	_____
50. Allow PO to visit your residence	_____	_____	_____	_____
51. Allow PO to visit your employment site	_____	_____	_____	_____
52. Pay monthly cost of supervision	_____	_____	_____	_____
53. Pay court cost	_____	_____	_____	_____
54. Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	_____	_____	_____	_____
55. Complete mandatory CS hours	_____	_____	_____	_____
56. Complete work crew days	_____	_____	_____	_____
57. Complete a jail sentence	_____	_____	_____	_____
58. Pay restitution	_____	_____	_____	_____
59. Submit to random screens	_____	_____	_____	_____
60. Do not possess or consume alcohol	_____	_____	_____	_____

Was the violation a technical violation? (If yes, list verbatim the offense in the order the offense occurred and complete columns a, b and c) (do not read answer options)	Number of times it occurred (indicate number)	Outcome (code outcome of the violation: 1= extended probation sentence, 2= additional condition(s), 3= days in jail, 4= other)	Details (explain each condition. If 1- list new term, if 2- list new condition, if 3- how many days, if 4- specify other)
61. Do not possess or consume illegal drugs	_____	_____	_____
62. Participate in alcohol treatment	_____	_____	_____
63. Participate in drug treatment	_____	_____	_____
64. Participate in mental health treatment	_____	_____	_____
65. Participate in employment program	_____	_____	_____
66. Complete Milepost class	_____	_____	_____
67. Complete Daily Alternative Reporting Tracking (DART) program	_____	_____	_____
68. Complete batterer's intervention program	_____	_____	_____
69. Complete anger management	_____	_____	_____
70. No contact with victim	_____	_____	_____
71. Attend alcohol safety education school	_____	_____	_____
72. Attend 1 victim impact panel	_____	_____	_____
73. Driver's license (DL) suspended/revoked	_____	_____	_____
74. Abide with order of impoundment	_____	_____	_____
75. Abide by curfew	_____	_____	_____
76. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
77. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
78. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
79. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
80. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
81. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____

[Read] I am going to ask about criminal sanctions and whether you have been sentenced to them in the past. Please indicate whether you have by answering yes or no.

	Yes	If yes, indicate length of time served (circle one)	No	DK	RF
82. Probation (prior to current sentence)	1	_____mos/yrs	0	98	99
83. Intensive supervision probation	1	_____mos/yrs	0	98	99

	Yes	If yes, indicate length of time served (circle one)	No	DK	RF
84. Jail	1	_____mos/yrs	0	98	99
85. Prison	1	_____mos/yrs	0	98	99
86. Day reporting	1	_____mos/yrs	0	98	99
87. Electronic monitoring	1	_____mos/yrs	0	98	99
88. Boot camp	1	_____mos/yrs	0	98	99

(If no to having served a prior sentence of probation, skip to #134)

89. Did you receive any violations for your prior probation sentence(s)? (circle one) <i>(If no, skip to #134)</i>	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99
Was the violation a new law violation? (If yes, list verbatim the offense in the order the offense occurred and complete columns a, b and c) <i>(If no, skip to #97)</i>	Date (indicate the date that the offense by mm/dd/yy).	Outcome (code the outcome of the violation: 1= extended probation sentence, 2= additional condition(s), 3= days in jail, 4= other)	Details (explain each condition If 1- list new term, if 2- list new condition, if 3- how many days, if 4- specify other)	
90. _____	_____	_____	_____	
91. _____	_____	_____	_____	
92. _____	_____	_____	_____	
93. _____	_____	_____	_____	
94. _____	_____	_____	_____	
95. _____	_____	_____	_____	
96. _____	_____	_____	_____	
Was the violation a technical violation? (If yes, list verbatim the offense in the order the offense occurred and complete columns a, b and c) (do not read answer options) <i>(If no, skip to #134)</i>	Number of time it occurred (indicate number)	Outcome (code outcome of the violation: 1= extended probation sentence, 2= additional condition(s), 3= days in jail, 4= other)	Details (explain how each condition was. If 1- list new term, if 2- list new condition, if 3- how many days, if 4- specify other)	
97. Report to probation office once a month	_____	_____	_____	
98. Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	_____	_____	_____	
99. Notify PO of changes in your residence	_____	_____	_____	
100. Notify PO of changes in your employment/education	_____	_____	_____	
101. Try to obtain employment	_____	_____	_____	
102. Maintain employment/school enrollment	_____	_____	_____	
103. Allow PO to visit your residence	_____	_____	_____	

Was the violation a technical violation? (If yes, list verbatim the offense in the order the offense occurred and complete columns a, b and c) (do not read answer options) (If no, skip to #134)	Number of time it occurred (indicate number)	Outcome (code outcome of the violation: 1= extended probation sentence, 2= additional condition(s), 3= days in jail, 4= other)	Details (explain how each condition was. If 1- list new term, if 2- list new condition, if 3- how many days, if 4- specify other)
104. Allow PO to visit your employment site	_____	_____	_____
105. Pay monthly cost of supervision	_____	_____	_____
106. Pay court cost	_____	_____	_____
107. Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	_____	_____	_____
108. Complete mandatory CS hours	_____	_____	_____
109. Complete work crew days	_____	_____	_____
110. Complete a jail sentence	_____	_____	_____
111. Pay restitution	_____	_____	_____
112. Submit to random screens	_____	_____	_____
113. Do not possess or consume alcohol	_____	_____	_____
114. Do not possess or consume illegal drugs	_____	_____	_____
115. Participate in alcohol treatment	_____	_____	_____
116. Participate in drug treatment	_____	_____	_____
117. Participate in mental health treatment	_____	_____	_____
118. Participate in employment program	_____	_____	_____
119. Complete Milepost class	_____	_____	_____
120. Complete DART program	_____	_____	_____
121. Complete batterer's intervention program	_____	_____	_____
122. Complete anger management	_____	_____	_____
123. No contact with victim	_____	_____	_____
124. Attend alcohol safety education school	_____	_____	_____
125. Attend 1 victim impact panel	_____	_____	_____
126. Driver's license (DL) suspended/revoked	_____	_____	_____
127. Abide with order of impoundment	_____	_____	_____
128. Abide by curfew	_____	_____	_____
129. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
130. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
131. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
132. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____
133. Other (_____)	_____	_____	_____

[Read] Now I want to ask you more specific questions about your current probation and your views on the severity of the conditions. I am going to list possible conditions of probation. Please indicate whether they apply to you by answering yes or no.

(circle one and specify where applicable)	Yes	Specify	No	DK	RF
134. Commit no new law violation	1		0	98	99
135. Report to probation office once a month	1		0	98	99
136. Answer truthfully to inquiries by probation officer	1		0	98	99
137. Notify PO of changes in your residence	1		0	98	99
138. Notify PO of changes in your employment/education	1		0	98	99
139. Try to obtain employment	1		0	98	99
140. Maintain employment/school enrollment	1		0	98	99
141. Allow PO to visit your residence	1		0	98	99
142. Allow PO to visit your employment site	1		0	98	99
143. Pay monthly cost of supervision (specify amount)	1	\$_____	0	98	99
144. Pay court cost (specify amount)	1	\$_____	0	98	99
145. Complete CS hours in lieu of fees (specify hours)	1	_____hrs	0	98	99
146. Complete mandatory CS hours (specify hours)	1	_____hrs	0	98	99
147. Complete work crew days (specify days)	1	_____days	0	98	99
148. Complete a jail sentence (specify days)	1	_____days	0	98	99
149. Pay restitution (specify amount)	1	\$_____	0	98	99
150. Submit to random screens (breathalyzer and urinalysis)	1		0	98	99
151. Do not possess or consume alcohol	1		0	98	99
152. Do not possess or consume illegal drugs	1		0	98	99
153. Participate in alcohol treatment	1		0	98	99
154. Participate in drug treatment	1		0	98	99
155. Participate in mental health treatment	1		0	98	99
156. Participate in employment program	1		0	98	99
157. Complete Milepost class	1		0	98	99
158. Complete DART program	1		0	98	99
159. Complete batterer's intervention program	1		0	98	99
160. Complete anger management	1		0	98	99
161. No contact with victim	1		0	98	99
162. Attend alcohol safety education school	1		0	98	99

(circle one and specify where applicable)	Yes	Specify	No	DK	RF
163. Attend 1 victim impact panel	1		0	98	99
164. Driver's license (DL) suspended/revoked (specify months)	1	_____mos	0	98	99
165. Abide with order of impoundment	1		0	98	99
166. Abide by curfew	1		0	98	99
167. Other (specify _____)	1		0	98	99
168. Other (specify _____)	1		0	98	99
169. Other (specify _____)	1		0	98	99
170. Other (specify _____)	1		0	98	99
171. Other (specify _____)	1		0	98	99
172. Other (specify _____)	1		0	98	99

173. **[Read]** Are there any conditions which I have not asked you about, but that you are required to complete or adhere to? If so, what are they?

[Read] I am going to ask you to rate the severity of the conditions of your probation. The response options are not severe, somewhat severe, severe and extremely severe (*Hand participant red answer card*) (**Read all the conditions and circle the answer option the participant selected, next turn tape recorder on and read column a and column b**)

(for all conditions circle one and then complete columns a and b with tape recorder on)	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	DK	RF	a. Why do you feel the condition is severe? (ask of each one coded 4)	Why do you feel the condition is not severe? (ask of each one coded 1)
174. Commit no new law violation	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
175. Report to probation once a month	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
176. Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
177. Notify PO of changes in residence	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
178. Notify PO of changes in employment/education	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____

(for all conditions circle one and then complete columns a and b with tape recorder on)	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	DK	RF	a. Why do you feel the condition is severe? (ask of each one coded 4)	b. Why do you feel the condition is not severe? (ask of each one coded 1)
179. Try to obtain employment	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
180. Maintain employment/school enrollment	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
181. Allow PO to visit residence	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
182. Allow PO to visit employment site	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
183. Pay monthly COS	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
184. Pay court costs	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
185. Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
186. Complete mandatory CS hours	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
187. Complete work crew days	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
188. Complete a jail sentence	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
189. Pay restitution	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
190. Submit to random screens	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
191. Do not possess or consume alcohol	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
192. Do not possess or consume illegal drugs	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
193. Participate in alcohol treatment	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
194. Participate in drug treatment	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
195. Participate in mental health treatment	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
196. Participate in employment program	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
197. Complete Milepost class	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
198. Complete DART program	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____

(for all conditions circle one and then complete columns a and b with tape recorder on)	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	DK	RF	a. Why do you feel the condition is severe? (ask of each one coded 4)	b. Why do you feel the condition is not severe? (ask of each one coded 1)
199. Complete Batterer's Intervention	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
200. Complete anger management	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
201. No contact with victim	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
202. Attend alcohol safety education school	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
203. Attend 1 victim impact panel	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
204. DL suspended/revoked	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
205. Abide with order of impoundment	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
206. Abide by curfew	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
207. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
208. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
209. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
210. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
211. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____

Turn off tape recorder once column a and column b are completed. [Read] The next set of questions asks you about your perception about the likelihood that you will be able to complete or follow the probation condition. The response options are not difficult, relatively easy, about 50/50, somewhat difficult and very difficult (*Hand participant yellow answer card*) (**Read all the conditions and circle the answer option the participant selected, next turn tape recorder on and read column a and column b**)

(for all conditions circle one and then complete columns a and b with tape recorder on)	Not difficult	Relatively easy	About 50/50	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	DK	RF	a. Why do you feel __ is very difficult? (ask for coded 5)	b. Why do you feel ___ is not difficult? (ask for coded 1)
212. Commit no new law violation	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
213. Report to probation once a month	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____

(for all conditions circle one and then complete columns a and b with tape recorder on)	Not difficult	Relatively easy	About 50/50	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	DK	RF	a. Why do you feel __ is very difficult? (ask for coded 5)	b. Why do you feel ___ is not difficult? (ask for coded 1)
214. Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
215. Notify PO of changes in residence	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
216. Notify PO of changes in employment/education	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
217. Try to obtain employment	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
218. Maintain employment/school enrollment	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
219. Allow PO to visit residence	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
220. Allow PO to visit employment site	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
221. Pay monthly cost of supervision	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
222. Pay court costs	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
223. Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
224. Complete mandatory CS hours	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
225. Complete work crew days	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
226. Complete a jail sentence	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
227. Pay restitution	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
228. Submit to random screens	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
229. Do not possess or consume alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
230. Do not possess or consume illegal drugs	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
231. Participate in alcohol treatment	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____

(for all conditions circle one and then complete columns a and b with tape recorder on)	Not difficult	Relatively easy	About 50/50	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	DK	RF	a. Why do you feel ___ is very difficult? (ask for coded 5)	b. Why do you feel ___ is not difficult? (ask for coded 1)
232. Participate in drug treatment	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
233. Participate in mental health treatment	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
234. Participate in employment program	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
235. Complete Milepost class	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
236. Complete DART program	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
237. Complete Batterer's Intervention	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
238. Complete anger management	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
239. No contact with victim	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
240. Attend alcohol safety education school	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
241. Attend 1 victim impact panel	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
242. DL suspended/revoked	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
243. Abide with order of impoundment	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
244. Abide by curfew	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
245. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
246. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
247. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
248. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
249. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____
250. other (specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5	98	99	_____	_____

(Adapted Petersilia & Deschenes 1994b)

[Read] 251. What do you think about the difficulty of your sentence of probation? (circle one and complete column a)

Not difficult 1 Relatively easy 2 About 50/50 3 Somewhat difficult 4 Very difficult 5 DK 98 RF 99

Why do you feel this way? Please explain

252. **[Read]** What do you think are some possible obstacles that you will face or are facing that could prevent you from successfully completing or adhering to your conditions of probation?

Turn tape recorder off. [Read] Now I am going to ask you some things that possibly could be an obstacle for a person on probation. Please indicate your level of agreement on whether the following items are obstacles for you. Your response options are strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree. *(Hand participant green card)*

(circle one)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	DK	RF
253. Finding a job	1	2	3	4	98	99
254. Finding a good paying job	1	2	3	4	98	99
255. Maintaining a job	1	2	3	4	98	99
256. Finding time to report monthly	1	2	3	4	98	99
257. Finding time to do CS hours	1	2	3	4	98	99
258. Finding time to do work crew	1	2	3	4	98	99
259. Transportation to work	1	2	3	4	98	99
260. Transportation to report monthly to probation office	1	2	3	4	98	99
261. Transportation to CS location	1	2	3	4	98	99
262. Transportation to work crew	1	2	3	4	98	99
263. Maintaining a residence	1	2	3	4	98	99
264. Paying court costs	1	2	3	4	98	99
265. Paying monthly cost of supervision	1	2	3	4	98	99
266. Paying restitution	1	2	3	4	98	99
267. Participating in treatment	1	2	3	4	98	99
268. Avoiding drinking alcohol	1	2	3	4	98	99
269. Avoiding using drugs	1	2	3	4	98	99
270. Neighborhood conditions	1	2	3	4	98	99
271. Lack of family support	1	2	3	4	98	99
272. Number of probation conditions	1	2	3	4	98	99

273. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** What are some possible things that would help increase the chances of you completing probation? Do you have any suggestions on how to remove or reduce the number of obstacles that you may face while on probation?

Turn tape recorder off.

[Read] I am going to ask about your perceptions about different types of criminal sanctions. First, I am going to ask you to rate the severity of several sentencing sanctions. If you are not familiar with any of the sanctions, please let me know and I can describe them to you. The response options are not severe, somewhat severe, severe and extremely severe (*Hand participant red card*) **Read all the conditions and circle the answer option the participant selected, next turn tape recorder on and read column a and column b)**

(for all sanctions circle one and then complete columns a and b with tape recorder on)	Not severe	Somewhat severe	Severe	Extremely severe	DK	RF	a. Why do you feel _____ is severe? (ask for each one coded 4)	b. Why do you feel _____ is not severe? (ask for each one coded 1)
274. \$100 fine	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
275. \$1000 fine	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
276. \$5000 fine	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
277. 1 year regular probation	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
278. 3 years regular probation	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
279. 5 years regular probation	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
280. 1 year Intensive supervision probation	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
281. 3 years Intensive supervision probation	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
282. 5 years Intensive supervision probation	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
283. 3 months in jail	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
284. 6 months in jail	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
285. 1 year in jail	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
286. 1 year in prison	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
287. 3 years in prison	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
288. 5 years in prison	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
289. 3 months day reporting	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
290. 6 months day reporting	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
291. 1 year day reporting	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
292. 3 months electronic monitoring	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
293. 6 months electronic monitoring	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
294. 1 year electronic monitoring	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
295. 3 months boot camp	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
296. 6 months boot camp	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____
297. 1 year boot camp	1	2	3	4	98	99	_____	_____

(Adapted from Petersilia & Deschenes 1994b)

298. (Hand participant orange card) [Read] Which of the listed conditions do you find to be the MOST severe? Why?

299. [Read] Which of the listed conditions do you find to be the LEAST severe? Why?

300. [Read] If you were able to make policy recommendations regarding the types of criminal sanctions that are used in our criminal justice system, what would you recommend?

301. [Read] Is there anything that I have not asked you about conditions of probation or sanction severity that you feel I should know?

Turn tape recorder off.

[Read] Now that I have asked you about probation, I would like to ask you about how personally afraid you are of the following crimes. For each of the following crimes please indicate if you are not afraid, somewhat afraid, afraid, or very afraid. (Hand participant purple card) In the past year how personally afraid have you been of:

(circle one)	Not Afraid	Somewhat Afraid	Afraid	Very Afraid	DK	RF
302. Being approached by a beggar or panhandler	1	2	3	4	98	99
303. Having someone break into your home while you are there	1	2	3	4	98	99
304. Being raped or sexually assaulted	1	2	3	4	98	99
305. Being murdered	1	2	3	4	98	99
306. Being attacked by someone with a weapon	1	2	3	4	98	99
307. Having your car stolen	1	2	3	4	98	99
308. Being robbed or mugged on the street	1	2	3	4	98	99
309. Having your property damaged	1	2	3	4	98	99
310. Being threatened by someone	1	2	3	4	98	99
311. Being beaten up by someone	1	2	3	4	98	99
312. Being shot at while walking down the street	1	2	3	4	98	99
313. Having your property damaged by graffiti or tagging	1	2	3	4	98	99
314. Having someone break into your home while you are away	1	2	3	4	98	99
315. Having someone commit a home invasion robbery against you	1	2	3	4	98	99
316. Being the victim of a drive-by or random shooting	1	2	3	4	98	99

(circle one)	Not Afraid	Somewhat Afraid	Afraid	Very Afraid	DK	RF
317. Being physically assaulted or attacked by someone without a weapon	1	2	3	4	98	99
318. Being harassed by someone	1	2	3	4	98	99
319. Being a victim of a car jacking	1	2	3	4	98	99
320. Having your money or property taken from you without force or weapon	1	2	3	4	98	99
321. Having your money or property taken from you with force or weapon	1	2	3	4	98	99
322. Being around drug use or sales	1	2	3	4	98	99

(Adapted from Ferraro, 1995; Lane, 2006; Lane et al., 1997; Lane et al., 2005)

323. **[Read]** Are there any other crimes that you are personally afraid of that are not listed here?

324. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** Which of the crimes are you MOST afraid of? Why?

325. **[Read]** Which of the crimes are you LEAST afraid of? Why?

Turn tape recorder off.

326. [Read] Now that you have indicated how personally afraid you are, I would like to know if you have been a victim of any of the previously listed crimes in the last year? (Read options & circle one)	Yes 1	No (skip to # 328) 0	DK (skip to # 328) 98	RF (skip to # 328) 99
---	----------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

327. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** Please describe which ones and what happened to you?

Turn tape recorder off.

328. [Read] Has your family been a victim of any of the previously listed crimes in the last year? (Read options & circle one)	Yes 1	No (skip to # 330) 0	DK (skip to # 330) 98	RF (skip to # 330) 99
---	----------	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

329. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** Please describe which crimes and what happened and to whom?

Turn tape recorder off.

330. **[Read]** In general, are you more, less, or equally afraid for other people living in your home as you are for yourself? (Read options & circle one) More Afraid Less Afraid Equally Afraid DK RF
1 2 3 98 99
(Lane et al., 1997)

[Read] Now I would like you to think about your family members. Of those living in your home, please indicate how personally afraid you are that each of the following family members will be a victim of a crime? Please tell us how afraid, somewhat afraid, afraid, or very afraid you are that (*Hand participant purple card*)

(circle one)	Not Afraid	Somewhat Afraid	Afraid	Very Afraid	N/A	DK	RF
331. Your father will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
332. Your mother will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
333. Your husband will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
334. Your wife will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
335. Your partner will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
336. Your son(s) will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
337. Your daughter(s) will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
338. Your brother(s) will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
339. Your sister(s) will be a victim of crime	1	2	3	4	97	98	99
340. Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3	4	97	98	99

341. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** Are you more afraid for them than yourself? Why?

Turn tape recorder off. [Read]: You have indicated how personally afraid you are for you and your family of the crimes listed. I would like you to indicate how likely it is that in the next year you will become a victim of the following crimes. Is it not likely, somewhat likely, likely, or very likely that you will (*Hand participant pink card*)

(Read options & circle one)	Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely	DK	RF
342. Be approached by a beggar or panhandler	1	2	3	4	98	99
343. Have someone break into your home while you are there	1	2	3	4	98	99
344. Be raped or sexually assaulted	1	2	3	4	98	99
345. Be murdered	1	2	3	4	98	99
346. Be attacked by someone with a weapon	1	2	3	4	98	99
347. Have your car stolen	1	2	3	4	98	99
348. Be robbed or mugged on the street	1	2	3	4	98	99
349. Have your property damaged	1	2	3	4	98	99
350. Be threatened by someone	1	2	3	4	98	99

(Read options & circle one)	Not Likely	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely	DK	RF
351. Be beaten up by someone	1	2	3	4	98	99
352. Be shot at while walking down the street	1	2	3	4	98	99
353. Have your property damaged by graffiti or tagging	1	2	3	4	98	99
354. Have someone break into your home while you are away	1	2	3	4	98	99
355. Have someone commit a home invasion robbery against you	1	2	3	4	98	99
356. Be the victim of a drive-by or random shooting	1	2	3	4	98	99
357. Be physically assaulted or attacked by someone	1	2	3	4	98	99
358. Be harassed by someone	1	2	3	4	98	99
359. Be a victim of a car jacking	1	2	3	4	98	99
360. Have your money or property taken from you without force or weapon	1	2	3	4	98	99
361. Have your money or property taken from you with force or weapon	1	2	3	4	98	99
362. Be around drug use or sales	1	2	3	4	98	99

(Adapted from Ferraro, 1995; Lane, 2006; Lane et al., 1997; Lane et. al., 2005)

[Read]: Now I would like to ask you about the crimes that you have committed in the past, please indicate if you have taken part in any of the following crimes by indicating yes or no? Please remember that your answers are confidential. (Read options & circle one)

	Yes	No	DK	RF
363. Broken into someone's home when people are present	1	0	98	99
364. Raped or sexually assaulted someone	1	0	98	99
365. Attacked someone with a weapon	1	0	98	99
366. Stolen a car	1	0	98	99
367. Robbed or mugged someone on the street	1	0	98	99
368. Vandalized someone's property	1	0	98	99
369. Threatened someone with a weapon	1	0	98	99
370. Beaten up or physically assaulted someone	1	0	98	99
371. Shot at someone while walking down the street	1	0	98	99
372. Damaged someone's property with graffiti or tagging	1	0	98	99
373. Broken into someone's home while they were away	1	0	98	99
374. Committed a home invasion robbery against someone	1	0	98	99
375. Participated in a drive-by or random shooting	1	0	98	99
376. Harassed or threatened someone	1	0	98	99
377. Car jacked someone	1	0	98	99

	Yes	No	DK	RF
378. Dealt or delivered drugs (made, sold, or moved)	1	0	98	99
379. Possessed drugs (marijuana, cocaine, crack, etc)	1	0	98	99
380. Been in a gang	1	0	98	99
381. Stolen someone's money or property with force	1	0	98	99
382. Stolen someone's money or property without force	1	0	98	99
383. Approach someone on the street asking for money or trying to panhandle	1	0	98	99

384. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** Do you feel that taking part in these activities has made you feel more or less afraid? Why?

385. **[Read]** Do you feel that taking part in these activities has made you feel more or less afraid for your family? Why?

Turn tape recorder off.

386. **[Read]** Do you feel that your participation in crime makes it more or less likely that your family will be victimized? Would you say it is... (Read options & circle one)

	Much less likely	Less likely	More likely	Much more likely	DK	RF
	1	2	3	4	98	99

[Read]: Now I would like to ask you about some of things you have done to protect yourself from crime. Please remember your answers are confidential and if you prefer not to answer a question you may skip it. In order to feel safer from being a victim of crime, in the past year did you... (Read options & circle one)

	Yes	No	DK	RF
387. Buy or secure a gun	1	0	98	99
388. Carry a gun	1	0	98	99
389. Carry a weapon other than a gun when you went out	1	0	98	99
390. Arrange to go out with someone so you would not be alone	1	0	98	99
391. Avoid certain areas of your neighborhood or community	1	0	98	99
392. Join a gang for protection	1	0	98	99
393. Hangout with gang members	1	0	98	99
394. Buy an alarm or security system	1	0	98	99
395. Install extra locks on your home or car	1	0	98	99
396. Buy a watchdog	1	0	98	99
397. Added outside lighting	1	0	98	99
398. Limit or change your daily routine because of crime	1	0	98	99

(Adapted from Ferraro, 1995; Lane, 2009; Lane et al., 1997; Lane & Meeker, 2004)

399. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** What crime(s) were you trying to avoid by taking the previously listed options? Please explain.

400. **[Read]** Do you feel that doing these things have helped keep you safe? Please explain how.

401. **[Read]** Now we have reached the last section of the questionnaire. Here I would like to ask you about the neighborhood you live in. Please think of your current neighborhood when answering the following questions. How would you describe the people who live in your neighborhood in terms of income? How many of them live in poverty?

402. **[Read]** How would you describe the people who live in your neighborhood in terms of education?

403. [Read] If you had a problem, could you rely on your neighbors for help? (Read options & circle one)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99
--	----------	---------	----------	----------

404. **[Read]** What, specifically, do you think you could rely on your neighbors for? Why?

405. **[Read]** What could you not rely on them for? Why?

Turn tape recorder off.

406. [Read] Can you trust your neighbors? (Read options & circle one) (Earls et al., 1994)	Never 1	Some of the time 2	All of the time 3	DK 98	RF 99
407. [Read] Would your neighbors be willing to help one another? (Read options & circle one) (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2001)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99	
408. [Read] Would your neighbors do something if they saw unattended kids misbehaving? (Read options & circle one) (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2001)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99	
409. [Read] Would your neighbors do something if they saw a crime occur? (Read options & circle one) (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2001)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99	

410. [Read] How much do you feel like you belong to your neighborhood? Would you say... (Read options & circle one) (Ferraro, 1995; Lane et al., 1997)	I don't feel a part of it 1	Sometimes I feel a part of it 2	I feel very much a part of it 3	DK 98	RF 99	
411. [Read] Which of the following best illustrates how racially mixed your neighborhood is: (Read options & circle one)	Not very mixed: Most people are of the same race 1	Somewhat mixed: Some people of different race 2	Very mixed: People are of various racial backgrounds 3	DK 98	RF 99	
412. [Read] When thinking of those who live near your home, if you were to move away in the next year, how many would you really miss? (Read options & circle one) (Ferraro, 1995)	None 1	Some of them 2	A lot of them 3	All of the them 4	DK 98	RF 99
413. [Read] How often do people move in and out of your neighborhood? (Read options & circle one) (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2001)	Rarely 1	Sometimes 2	Often 3	DK 98	RF 99	
414. [Read] Do you see strangers in your neighborhood? (Read options & circle one) (Ferraro, 1995)	Never 1	Almost never 2	Sometimes 3	Very often 4	DK 98	RF 99

[Read]: The next questions ask about how safe you feel in your neighborhood. Please indicate if you feel very unsafe, somewhat unsafe, somewhat safe, or very safe. (*Hand participant blue card*) (Adapted from Ferraro, 1995)

(circle one)	Very unsafe 1	Somewhat unsafe 2	Somewhat safe 3	Very safe 4	DK 98	RF 99
415. How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood during the day	1	2	3	4	98	99
416. How safe do you feel out alone in your neighborhood at night	1	2	3	4	98	99
417. How safe from crime do you feel inside your home during the day	1	2	3	4	98	99
418. How safe from crime do you feel inside your home during the night	1	2	3	4	98	99
419. How safe do you feel living in your neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	98	99

420. [Read] Is there any area in your neighborhood where you would be afraid to walk alone at night? (Read options & circle one)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99	
421. [Read] Is there any area in your neighborhood where you would be afraid to walk alone at during the day? (Read options & circle one)	Yes 1	No 0	DK 98	RF 99	
422. [Read] In the past year, do you feel safer, not as safe, or about the same in your community? (Read options & circle one) (Lane et al., 1997)	Safer 1	Not as safe 2	About the same 3	DK 98	RF 99

[Read]: Based on the following crimes listed, do you feel that your community has a lot, moderate amount, small amount, or none of the following crimes? (*Hand participant light blue card*)

(circle one)	None	Small Amount	Moderate Amount	A lot	DK	RF
423. Property crime like burglary or theft	1	2	3	4	98	99
424. Violent crime like assault or murder	1	2	3	4	98	99
425. Drug related crimes (selling or distributing)	1	2	3	4	98	99
426. Property crimes by gangs	1	2	3	4	98	99
427. Violent crimes by gangs	1	2	3	4	98	99

(Adapted from Lane et al., 1997)

[Read] I am going to ask you some questions about the neighborhood you live in, as you define it. I would like you to think of your neighborhood and some of the problems in your community and how serious they are. Please indicate if the following items are a big problem, somewhat of a problem, problem, or not a problem. (*Hand participant light purple card*)

(circle one)	Not a problem	Somewhat of a problem	A problem	A big problem	DK	RF
428. Litter, broken glass, or trash on sidewalks or streets	1	2	3	4	98	99
429. Graffiti on buildings or walls	1	2	3	4	98	99
430. Vacant or deserted homes, cars, or storefronts	1	2	3	4	98	99
431. Buildings that are falling apart or run down	1	2	3	4	98	99
432. Drinking in public	1	2	3	4	98	99
433. People selling drugs on the streets	1	2	3	4	98	99
434. Groups of teens or adults hanging out and causing trouble	1	2	3	4	98	99
435. Poverty or financial hardship	1	2	3	4	98	99
436. Language differences between residents	1	2	3	4	98	99
437. Cultural differences between residents	1	2	3	4	98	99
438. Too many people living in one home	1	2	3	4	98	99
439. Gunfire	1	2	3	4	98	99
440. Gangs	1	2	3	4	98	99
441. People drunk on the streets	1	2	3	4	98	99
442. Unsupervised youth	1	2	3	4	98	99
443. Kids behaving badly	1	2	3	4	98	99
444. People moving in and out a lot	1	2	3	4	98	99
445. Needles on the street	1	2	3	4	98	99
446. People using drugs	1	2	3	4	98	99
447. People vandalizing or damaging other people's property	1	2	3	4	98	99

(Adapted from Earls et al., 1994-95; Ferraro, 1995; Lane et al., 1997; Sampson & Raudenbush, 2001).

448. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** Specifically, what crimes are MOST problematic to you in your neighborhood? Why?

449. **[Read]** What crimes are LEAST problematic to you in your neighborhood? Why?

Turn tape recorder off.

450. **[Read]** Overall, in the past year, would you say your community has become a better place to live, has gotten worse, or is about the same as it used to be? (Read options & circle one) (Lane et al., 1997)

	Worse	Better	About the same	DK	RF
	1	2	3	98	99

451. **[Read]** Do you think that crime in your neighborhood has increased, remained the same, or decreased in the last year? (Read options & circle one) (Lane et al., 1997)

	Increased	Stayed the same	Decreased	DK	RF
	1	2	3	98	99

452. **Turn tape recorder on. [Read]** If you have noticed an increase in crime, which crimes would you indicate to have increased?

453. **[Read]** Is there anything about fear of crime that you feel is important for me to know that I have not asked you about?

Turn tape recorder off and thank the participant for participating.

APPENDIX H
ANSWER CARD OPTIONS

Red Card

Not Severe	Somewhat Severe	Severe	Extremely Severe
---------------	--------------------	--------	---------------------

Yellow Card

Not difficult 90% chance I can do it 1	Relatively easy 75% chance I can do it 2	About 50/50 chance I can do it 3	Somewhat difficult 25% chance I can do it 4	Very difficult 10% chance I can do it 5
---	---	---	--	--

Green Card

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-------	-------------------

Orange Card

\$100 fine

\$1000 fine

\$5000 fine

1 year regular probation

3 years regular probation

5 years regular probation

1 year intensive supervision probation

3 years intensive supervision probation

5 years intensive supervision probation

3 months in jail

6 months in jail

1 year in jail

1 year in prison

3 years in prison

5 years in prison

3 months day reporting

6 months day reporting

1 year day reporting

3 months electronic monitoring

6 months electronic monitoring

1 year electronic monitoring

3 months boot camp

6 months boot camp

1 year boot camp

APPENDIX I
NOT INTERVIEWED SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

Table I-1. Not interviewed sample description of based on official data

	Codes	No Showed N= 79		Will Contact Researchers N= 8		Cancelled N= 10		No Direct Contact N= 32	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Demographics									
Age									
Mean age		31.7		30.3		29.6		38.4	
Age range		19-66		20-45		22-38		20-64	
Gender									
Female	0	23	29.1	1	12.5	4	40.0	13	40.6
Male	1	56	70.9	7	87.5	6	60.0	19	59.4
Race									
White	1	30	38.0	8	100.0	6	60.0	16	50.0
Black	2	49	62.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	16	50.0
Asian	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Juvenile Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	20	25.3	1	12.5	1	10.0	7	21.9
Mean age of first arrest		15.7		17.0		14.0		15.4	
Mean number of arrests		2.1		1.0		1.0		2.3	
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	4	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3
Adult Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	68	86.1	5	62.5	8	80.0	22	68.8
No Florida (FL) history	Yes= 1	3	4.4	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	4.5
FL & 1 additional jurisdiction	1	12	17.6	0	0.0	1	10.0	2	9.1
FL & 2 additional jurisdiction	2	3	4.4	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
FL & 3 additional jurisdiction	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Arrest history									
Mean age of first arrest		21.2		21.0		21.5		23.8	
Mean number of arrests		7.4		5.2		5.9		7.5	

Table I-1. Continued

		No Showed N= 79		Will Contact Researchers N= 8		Cancelled N= 10		No Direct Contact N= 32	
Codes		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mean seriousness history		4.7		4.0		4.7		3.8	
Range seriousness history		0-15		0-10		0-15		0-14	
Probation history									
Prior probation present	Yes= 1	43	63.2	5	100.0	7	87.5	16	72.7
Mean number of probation		2.5		1.8		2.0		1.9	
Mean longest probation sentence (in months)		17.4		45.6		30.0		21.1	
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	37	54.4	4	80.0	3	37.5	11	50.0
Mean number of violations		2.9		1.3		1.3		2.8	
Mean number of new law violations		2.2		2.0		2.0		1.2	
Jail history									
Jail sentence present	Yes= 1	32	47.1	1	20.0	4	50.0	8	36.4
Mean number of jail sentences		3.3		2.0		2.3		2.8	
Mean longest jail sentence (in days)		151.0		180		79.3		85.5	
Prison history									
Prison sentence present	Yes= 1	9	13.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6
Mean number of prison sentences		2.4		0.0		0.0		1.0	
Mean longest prison sentence (in months)		115.4		0.0		0.0		32.0	
Parole violation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sanction seriousness history									
Mean sanction history		1.3		0.9		1.5		1.3	
Range sanction history		0-6		0-3		0-3		0-6	
Alternative sanction(s) present	Yes= 1	3	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5

Table I-1. Continued

	Codes	No Showed N= 79		Will Contact Researchers N= 8		Cancelled N= 10		No Direct Contact N= 32	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pretrial release violation present	Yes= 1	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Pretrial diversion present	Yes= 1	9	13.2	0	0.0	1	12.5	3	13.6
Current Probation									
Type of offense									
Public order	1	35	44.3	8	100.0	7	70.0	22	68.8
Drug	2	5	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.1
Property	3	14	17.7	0	0.0	2	20.0	4	12.5
Violent	4	25	31.6	0	0.0	10	10.0	5	15.6
Charges									
Mean number of current charges		1.4		1.4		1.5		15.0	
Reduction in charges	Yes= 1	19	24.1	1	12.5	1	10.0	6	18.8
Reduction in counts	Yes= 1	4	5.1	0	0.0	2	20.0	3	9.4
Reduction in offense level	Yes= 1	7	8.9	0	0.0	3	30.0	7	21.9
Sentence									
Mean sentence length (in months)		10.9		10.5		10.8		12.6	
Sentence range (in months)		6-15		6-12		6-12		12-60	
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	16	20.3	3	37.5	1	10.0	5	15.6
New law violation present	Yes= 1	10	62.5	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	60.0
Mean number of new law violations		1.5		1.0		0.0		1.7	
Technical violation	Yes= 1	14	87.5	3	100.0	1	100.0	3	60.0
Mean number of technical violations		3.5		1.7		5.0		2.6	

Table I-2. Not interviewed sample description of based on official data- refused

	Codes	Failed to Report N= 7		Refused- No Interest N= 47		Refused- Done with Both Incentives N= 18		Ineligible- Violated N=63	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Demographics									
Age									
Mean age		38.1		37.2		39.0		34.7	
Age range		25-49		20-68		21-66		20-63	
Gender									
Female	0	1	14.3	8	17.0	3	16.7	16	25.4
Male	1	6	85.7	39	83.0	15	83.3	47	74.6
Race									
White	1	1	14.3	21	44.7	15	83.3	21	33.3
Black	2	6	85.7	25	53.2	3	16.7	42	66.7
Asian	3	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Juvenile Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	5	10.6	0	0.0	15	23.8
Mean age of first arrest		0.0		16.6		0		14.6	
Mean number of arrests		0.0		1.5		0		6.2	
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	26.7
Adult Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	7	100.0	35	74.5	9	50.0	55	87.3
No Florida (FL) history	Yes= 1	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
FL & 1 additional jurisdiction	1	2	28.6	6	17.1	0	0.0	7	12.7
FL & 2 additional jurisdiction	2	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	3.6
FL & 3 additional jurisdiction	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Arrest history									
Mean age of first arrest		21.6		25.1		25.9		20.5	
Mean number of arrests		12.1		6.8		6.0		13.4	
Mean seriousness history		5.6		3.2		2.2		6.5	
Range seriousness history		0-15		0-11		0-10		0-15	

Table I-2. Continued

	Codes	Failed to Report N= 7		Refused- No Interest N= 47		Refused- Done with Both Incentives N= 18		Ineligible- Violated N=63	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Probation history									
Prior probation present	Yes= 1	3	42.9	23	65.7	7	77.8	44	80.0
Mean number of probation		2.0		2.0		2.7		3.2	
Mean longest probation sentence (in months)		42.0		18.6		12.9		29.6	
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	4	57.1	13	37.1	4	44.4	40	72.7
Mean number of violations		3.0		2.7		3.3		4.5	
Mean number of new law violations		1.0		1.8		0.0		3.2	
Jail history									
Jail sentence present	Yes= 1	3	42.9	16	45.7	5	55.6	39	70.9
Mean number of jail sentences		6.3		3.1		3.4		4.6	
Mean longest jail sentence (in days)		211		147.9		75.6		161.3	
Prison history									
Prison sentence present	Yes= 1	2	42.9	5	14.3	2	22.2	21	31.2
Mean number of prison sentences		4.3		3.2		1.0		3.8	
Mean longest prison sentence (in months)		120		166.6		16.5		622.6	
Parole violation present	Yes= 1	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8
Sanction seriousness history									
Mean sanction history		2.6		1.5		1.3		2.9	
Range sanction history		0-6		0-6		0-6		0-6	

Table I-2. Continued

	Codes	Failed to Report N= 7		Refused- No Interest N= 47		Refused- Done with Both Incentives N= 18		Ineligible- Violated N=63	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alternative sanction(s) present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0	4	7.3
Pretrial release violation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8
Pretrial diversion present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	3	8.6	0	0.0	2	3.6
Current Probation									
Type of offense									
Public order	1	4	57.1	26	55.3	11	61.1	24	38.1
Drug	2	2	28.6	4	8.5	2	11.1	12	19.0
Property	3	1	14.3	7	14.9	2	11.1	13	20.6
Violent	4	0	0.0	10	21.3	3	16.7	14	22.2
Charges									
Mean number of current charges		1.1		1.4		1.3		1.4	
Reduction in charges	Yes= 1	1	14.3	11	23.4	3	16.7	10	15.9
Reduction in counts	Yes= 1	0	0.0	2	4.3	0	0.0	2	3.2
Reduction in offense level	Yes= 1	1	14.3	6	12.8	2	11.1	13	20.6
Sentence									
Mean sentence length (in months)		10.3		11.4		11.0		10.2	
Sentence range (in months)		6-12		6-12		6-12		6-12	
Violation of probation									
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	1	14.3	13	27.6	3	16.7	54	85.7
New law violation present	Yes= 1	1	100.0	6	46.2	2	66.7	32	
Mean number of new law violations		1.0		1.5		2.0		2.3	
Technical violation	Yes= 1	1	100.0	9	69.2	3	100.0	52	96.3
Mean number of technical violations		4.0		1.9		3.0		3.8	

Table I-3. Not interviewed sample description of based on official data- ineligible

	Codes	Ineligible- End of Sentence N= 9		Ineligible- Early Termination N= 17		Ineligible- Mail in Status N= 20		Ineligible- Administrative N=5	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Demographics									
Age									
Mean age		31.2		29.2		31.3		40.4	
Age range		22-46		20-43		20-51		22-57	
Gender									
Female	0	1	11.1	2	11.8	3	15.0	1	20.0
Male	1	8	88.9	15	88.2	17	85.0	4	80.0
Race									
White	1	4	44.4	13	76.5	16	80.0	3	60.0
Black	2	5	55.6	4	23.5	2	10.0	1	20.0
Asian	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.0	1	20.0
Juvenile Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	1	5.9	3	15.0	1	20.0
Mean age of first arrest		0	0.0	17.0		15.3		15.0	
Mean number of arrests		0	0.0	1.0		6.3		3.0	
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0
Adult Justice System History									
History present	Yes= 1	6	66.7	8	47.1	12	60.0	3	60.0
No Florida (FL) history	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
FL & 1 additional jurisdiction	1	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	8.3	0	0.0
FL & 2 additional jurisdiction	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
FL & 3 additional jurisdiction	3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
Arrest history									
Mean age of first arrest		23.2		22.1		24.1		20.7	
Mean number of arrests		2.3		4.8		8.9		2.3	
Mean seriousness history		3.2		2.9		3.1		3.0	
Range seriousness history		0-8		0-10		0-15		0-10	

Table I-3. Continued

	Codes	Ineligible- End of Sentence N= 9		Ineligible- Early Termination N= 17		Ineligible- Mail in Status N= 20		Ineligible- Administrative N=5		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Probation history										
Prior probation present	Yes= 1	1	16.7	5	62.5	5	41.7	1	20.0	
Mean number of probation		1.0		2.4		3.4		1.0		
Mean longest probation sentence (in months)		12.0		9.6		20.4		12.0		
Violation of probation										
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	4	50.0	7	58.3	1	20.0	
Mean number of violations		0	0.0	2.5		2.7		1.0		
Mean number of new law violations		0	0.0	2.3		1.8		1.0		
Jail history										
Jail sentence present	Yes= 1	1	16.7	3	37.5	5	41.7	1	33.3	
Mean number of jail sentences		2.0		3.3		2.8		1.0		
Mean longest jail sentence (in days)		90		130		115.2		364.0		
Prison history										
Prison sentence present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	0	0.0	
Mean number of prison sentences		0.0		0.0		5.3		0.0		
Mean longest prison sentence (in months)		0.0		0.0		400.0		0.0		
Parole violation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Sanction seriousness history										
Mean sanction history		0.3		0.7		1.2		0.6		
Range sanction history		0-2		0-3		0-6		0-3		
Alternative sanction(s) present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	8.0	0	0.0	

Table I-3. Continued

	Codes	Ineligible- End of Sentence N= 9		Ineligible- Early Termination N= 17		Ineligible- Mail in Status N= 20		Ineligible- Administrative N=5		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Pretrial release violation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Pretrial diversion present	Yes= 1	2	22.2	2	25.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	
Current Probation										
Type of offense										
Public order	1	3	33.3	8	47.1	13	65.0	4	80.0	
Drug	2	3	33.3	4	23.5	1	5.0	0	0.0	
Property	3	0	0.0	3	17.6	3	15.0	1	20.0	
Violent	4	3	33.3	2	11.8	3	15.0	0	0.0	
Charges										
Mean number of current charges		1.3		1.4		1.2		1.2		
Reduction in charges	Yes= 1	3	33.3	8	47.1	3	15.0	0	0.0	
Reduction in counts	Yes= 1	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	
Reduction in offense level	Yes= 1	5	55.6	2	11.8	6	30.0	0	0.0	
Sentence										
Mean sentence length (in months)		10.0		10.9		11.1		10.8		
Sentence range (in months)		6-12		6-12		6-12		6-12		
Violation of probation										
Violation of probation present	Yes= 1	1	11.1	0	0.0	4	20.0	0	0.0	
New law violation present	Yes= 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.0	0	0.0	
Mean number of new law violations		0.0		0.0		1.5		0.0		
Technical violation	Yes= 1	1	100	0	0.0	4	20.0	0	0.0	
Mean number of technical violations		1.0		0.0		4.0		0.0		

APPENDIX J
PERCENTAGES AND FREQUENCIES BY SUBSAMPLE

Table J-1. Percentages for severity scales based on factor analysis by subsample

Severity scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	
Routine Condition Scale						1.5						1.6	-0.40
Item 1: No new law violation	149	69.1	14.1	8.1	8.7	1.6	49	65.3	6.1	14.3	14.3	1.8	-1.15
Item 2: Report monthly	153	64.7	15.0	9.2	11.1	1.7	49	53.1	18.4	18.4	10.2	1.9	-1.10
Item 3: Answer truthfully	153	75.2	7.8	7.8	9.2	1.5	49	75.5	6.1	14.3	4.1	1.5	0.30
Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence	153	75.2	9.8	9.8	5.2	1.5	49	77.6	4.1	12.2	6.1	1.5	-0.12
Item 5: Notify PO of changes in Employment	148	70.9	13.5	9.5	6.1	1.5	49	75.5	8.2	12.2	4.1	1.5	0.40
Offender Specific Scale						1.8						1.7	0.74
Item 1: Participate in mental health treatment	87	57.5	13.8	23.0	5.7	1.8	46	50.0	26.1	17.4	6.5	1.8	-0.19
Item 2: Participate in employment program	84	58.3	19.0	20.2	2.4	1.7	43	53.5	27.9	9.3	9.3	1.7	-0.44
Item 3: Complete Batterer's Intervention	81	53.1	12.3	23.5	11.1	1.9	43	62.8	23.3	8.2	4.1	1.6	2.06*
Item 4: Complete anger management	83	53.0	13.3	27.7	6.0	1.9	43	65.1	16.3	14.0	4.7	1.6	1.61
Item 5: No contact with victim	80	58.8	13.8	15.0	12.5	1.8	44	61.4	20.5	6.8	11.4	1.7	0.66
Item 6: Attend one victim impact panel	105	61.0	19.0	12.4	7.6	1.7	46	60.9	21.7	13.0	4.3	1.6	0.66

Likert Scale: NS= Not severe 1, SS= Somewhat severe 2, S= Severe 3 and EX= Extremely Severe 4
T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-1. Continued

Severity scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	
Offense Specific Scale						1.7						1.9	-1.29
Item 1: Submit to random screens	133	57.9	15.8	14.3	12.0	1.8	47	36.2	21.3	25.5	17.0	2.2	-2.27*
Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol	137	57.7	20.4	13.1	8.8	1.7	48	45.8	22.9	16.7	14.6	2.0	-1.49
Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	138	76.1	7.2	9.4	7.2	1.5	47	63.8	14.9	10.6	10.6	1.7	-1.18
Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment (TX)	117	56.4	21.4	17.9	4.3	1.7	46	41.3	21.7	26.1	10.9	2.1	-2.05*
Item 5: Participate in drug TX	97	47.4	23.7	22.7	6.2	1.9	44	43.2	27.3	18.2	11.4	2.0	-0.54
Item 6: Attend driver's course	114	50.9	24.6	17.5	7.0	1.8	46	45.7	26.1	23.9	4.3	1.9	-0.38
Punitive-Activity Scale						2.4						2.2	0.92
Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours	133	39.8	24.1	19.5	16.5	2.1	48	33.3	29.2	20.8	16.7	2.2	-0.44
Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	121	47.1	22.3	18.2	12.4	2.0	48	52.1	18.8	12.5	16.7	1.9	0.11
Item 3: Complete work crew days	99	30.2	18.2	27.3	24.2	2.5	46	37.0	10.9	30.4	21.7	2.4	0.40
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	107	20.6	10.3	29.9	39.3	2.9	46	28.3	10.9	28.3	32.6	2.7	1.07

Likert Scale: NS= Not severe 1, SS= Somewhat severe 2, S= Severe 3 and ES= Extremely severe 4
T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-1. Continued

Severity scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	
Punitive-Restrictive Scale						2.4						2.7	-1.44
Item 1: Driver's license suspended/revoked	120	20.0	20.0	24.4	35.8	2.8	47	12.8	14.9	19.1	53.2	3.1	-1.93
Item 2: Abide with order of impoundment	107	34.6	17.8	28.0	19.6	2.3	46	34.8	13.0	23.9	28.3	2.5	-0.60
Item 3: Abide by curfew	79	31.6	16.5	35.4	16.5	2.4	41	31.7	7.3	31.7	29.3	2.6	-0.96
Standard-Financial Scale						2.4						2.4	0.33
Item 1: Pay monthly cost of supervision	150	26.0	34.7	20.0	19.3	2.3	48	27.1	31.3	31.3	10.4	2.3	0.46
Item 2: Pay court costs	146	20.5	30.8	23.3	25.3	2.5	49	24.5	24.5	30.6	20.4	2.5	0.36
Standard-Visit Scale						1.9						1.8	0.47
Item 1: Allow PO to visit residence	147	57.1	24.5	8.2	10.2	1.7	49	57.1	22.4	12.2	8.2	1.7	0.00
Item 2: Allow PO to visit employment site	138	47.8	23.9	10.1	18.1	2.0	49	49.0	26.5	14.3	10.2	1.9	0.73
Standard-Employment Scale						1.7						1.7	0.04
Item 1: Try to obtain employment	138	57.2	16.7	10.9	15.2	1.8	49	55.1	18.4	18.4	8.2	1.8	0.26
Item 2: Maintain employment/enrollment	137	62.8	16.8	11.7	8.8	1.7	49	57.1	26.5	12.2	4.1	1.6	0.21

Likert Scale: NS= Not severe 1, SS= Somewhat severe 2, S= Severe 3 and ES= Extremely severe 4

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-2. Percentage for severity scales and variables based on the literature by group

Severity scales based on literature	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	
Severity Standard Scale						1.8						1.8	-0.03
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	149	69.1	14.1	8.1	8.7	1.6	49	65.3	6.1	14.3	14.3	1.8	-1.15
Item 2: Report to probation once a month	153	64.7	15.0	9.2	11.1	1.7	49	53.1	18.4	18.4	10.2	1.9	-1.10
Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	153	75.2	7.8	7.8	9.2	1.5	49	75.5	6.1	14.3	4.1	1.5	0.27
Item 4: Notify PO of changes in residence	153	75.2	9.8	9.8	5.2	1.5	49	77.6	4.1	12.2	6.1	1.5	-0.12
Item 5: Notify PO of changes in Employment	148	70.9	13.5	9.5	6.1	1.5	49	75.5	8.2	12.2	4.1	1.5	0.40
Item 6: Try to obtain employment	138	57.2	16.9	10.9	15.2	1.8	49	55.1	18.4	18.4	8.2	1.8	0.26
Item 7: Maintain employment/enrollment	137	62.8	16.8	11.7	8.8	1.7	49	57.1	26.5	12.2	4.1	1.6	0.21
Item 8: Allow PO to visit residence	147	57.1	24.5	8.2	10.2	1.7	49	57.1	22.4	12.2	8.2	1.7	0.00
Item 9: Allow PO to visit employment site	138	47.8	23.9	10.1	18.1	2.0	49	49.0	26.5	14.3	10.2	1.9	0.73
Item 10: Pay monthly cost of supervision	150	26.0	34.7	20.0	19.3	2.3	48	27.1	31.3	31.3	10.4	2.3	0.46
Item 11: Pay court costs	146	20.5	30.8	23.3	25.3	2.5	49	24.5	24.5	30.6	20.4	2.5	0.36

Likert Scale: NS= Not severe 1, SS= Somewhat severe 2, S= Severe 3 and ES= Extremely severe 4

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-2. Continued

Severity scales based on literature	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	
Severity Treatment Scale	133	57.9	15.8	14.3	12.0	1.7						1.8	-1.23
Item 1: Submit to random screens	137	57.7	20.4	13.1	8.8	1.8	47	36.2	21.3	25.5	17.0	2.2	-2.27
Item 2: Do not possess or consume alcohol	137	57.7	20.4	13.1	8.8	1.7	48	45.8	22.9	16.7	14.6	2.0	-1.49
Item 3: Do not possess or consume drugs	138	76.1	7.2	9.4	7.2	1.5	47	63.8	14.9	10.6	10.6	1.7	-1.18
Item 4: Participate in alcohol TX	117	56.4	21.4	17.9	4.3	1.7	46	41.3	21.7	26.1	10.9	2.1	-
Item 5: Participate in drug TX	97	47.4	23.7	22.7	6.2	1.9	44	43.2	27.3	18.2	11.4	2.0	-0.54
Item 6: Participate in mental health TX	87	57.5	13.8	23.0	5.7	1.8	46	50.0	26.1	17.4	6.5	1.8	-0.19
Item 7: Participate in employment program	84	58.3	19.0	20.2	2.4	1.7	43	53.5	27.9	9.3	9.3	1.7	-0.44
Item 8: Complete Milepost class	60	61.7	6.7	28.3	3.3	1.7	41	53.7	24.4	12.2	9.8	1.8	-0.23
Item 9: Complete batterer's intervention	81	53.1	12.3	23.5	11.1	1.9	43	62.8	23.3	9.3	4.7	1.6	2.06*
Item 10: Complete anger management	83	53.0	13.3	27.7	6.0	1.9	43	65.1	16.3	14.0	4.7	1.6	1.61
Item 11: Attend driver's course	114	50.9	24.6	17.5	7.0	1.8	46	45.7	26.1	23.9	4.3	1.9	-0.38

Likert Scale: NS= Not severe 1, SS= Somewhat severe 2, S= Severe 3 and ES= Extremely severe 4

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-2. Continued

Severity scales based on literature	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	N	NS	SS	S	ES	Mean	
Severity Punitive Scale						2.3						2.2	0.44
Item 1: Complete mandatory CS hours	133	39.8	24.1	19.5	16.5	2.1	48	33.3	29.2	20.8	16.7	2.2	-0.44
Item 2: Complete CS hours in lieu of fees	121	47.1	22.3	18.2	12.4	2.0	48	52.1	18.8	12.5	16.7	1.9	0.11
Item 3: Complete work crew days	99	30.3	18.2	27.3	24.2	2.5	46	37.0	10.9	30.4	21.7	2.4	0.40
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	107	20.6	10.3	29.9	39.3	2.9	46	28.3	10.9	28.3	32.6	2.7	1.07
Item 5: Pay restitution	93	34.4	28.0	24.7	12.9	2.2	45	37.8	24.4	22.2	15.6	2.2	0.03
Item 6: No contact with victim	80	58.8	13.8	15.0	12.5	1.8	44	61.4	20.5	6.8	11.4	1.7	0.66
Item 7: Attend one victim impact panel	105	61.0	19.0	12.4	7.6	1.7	46	60.9	21.7	13.0	4.3	1.6	0.36
Item 8: Driver's license suspended/revoked	120	20.0	20.0	24.2	35.8	2.8	47	12.8	14.9	19.1	53.2	3.1	-1.93
Item 9: Abide with order of impoundment	107	34.6	17.8	28.0	19.6	2.3	46	34.8	13.0	23.9	28.3	2.5	-0.60
Item 10: Abide by curfew	79	31.6	16.5	35.4	16.5	2.4	41	31.7	7.3	31.7	29.3	2.6	-0.96
Overall Severity Scale All thirty-two conditions						1.9						1.9	-0.54

Likert Scale: NS= Not severe 1, SS= Somewhat severe 2, S= Severe 3 and ES= Extremely severe 4

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-3. Percentages for difficulty scales based on factor analysis by subsample

Difficulty scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	
Mandatory Attendance Scale						1.9						1.9	0.08
Item 1: Participate in alcohol TX	49.1	17.3	19.1	10.0	4.5	2.0	37.8	33.3	13.3	4.4	11.1	2.2	-0.62
Item 2: Participate in drug TX	48.9	12.2	17.8	18.9	2.2	2.1	51.2	25.6	7.0	4.7	11.6	2.0	0.54
Item 3: Participate in mental health TX	51.2	15.5	13.1	17.9	2.4	2.1	48.9	28.9	6.7	4.4	11.1	2.0	0.20
Item 4: Participate in employment program	50.0	28.0	11.0	8.5	2.4	1.9	52.4	28.6	7.1	4.8	7.1	1.9	-.02
Item 5: Complete Milepost class	53.6	10.7	12.5	21.4	2.1	2.1	53.7	22.0	12.2	4.9	7.3	1.9	0.65
Item 6: Complete batterer's intervention	53.2	6.5	14.3	14.3	2.3	2.3	54.8	23.8	11.9	4.8	4.8	1.8	1.79
Item 7: Complete anger management	52.4	14.3	13.1	15.5	2.1	2.1	55.8	20.9	11.6	7.0	4.7	1.8	0.97
Item 8: Attend driver's course	49.5	18.1	10.5	15.2	2.1	2.1	41.3	26.1	15.2	8.7	8.7	2.2	-0.27
Item 9: Attend one victim impact panel	57.8	19.6	7.8	8.8	5.9	1.9	56.5	26.1	10.0	2.2	4.3	1.7	0.69

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-3. Continued

Difficulty scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	
Monetary Concerns Scale						3.1						3.0	0.55
Item 1: Pay monthly cost of supervision	26.0	12.0	20.0	24.0	18.0	3.0	26.5	18.4	22.4	16.3	16.3	2.8	0.78
Item 2: Pay court costs	20.5	13.0	15.8	26.0	24.7	3.2	20.4	10.2	20.4	26.5	22.4	3.2	0.03
Item 3: Complete work crew days	29.0	18.3	14.0	20.4	43.0	2.8	25.0	20.5	18.2	13.6	22.7	3.0	-0.29
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	22.0	5.0	10.0	20.0	43.0	3.6	24.4	11.1	4.4	20.0	40.0	3.4	0.58
Item 5: Pay restitution	23.9	13.6	15.9	25.0	21.6	3.1	29.5	20.5	13.6	18.2	18.2	2.8	1.15
Accountability Scale						1.8						2.0	-1.46
Item 1: Answer truthfully to inquiries by PO	85.5	10.5	3.3	0.0	0.7	1.2	77.6	16.3	2.0	4.1	0.0	1.3	-1.15
Item 2: Submit to random screens	71.3	15.5	9.3	3.1	0.8	1.5	59.6	25.5	8.5	2.1	4.3	1.7	-1.16
Item 3: Complete mandatory CS hours	38.6	19.7	18.9	11.4	11.4	2.4	29.8	19.1	19.1	12.8	19.1	2.7	-1.41
Item 4: CS hours in lieu of fees	39.5	22.7	13.4	14.3	10.1	2.3	38.3	17.0	17.0	6.4	21.3	2.6	-0.86

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-3. Continued

Difficulty scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	
Drug-Employment Scale						1.8						1.9	-0.54
Item 1: Try to obtain employment	88.4	9.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.2	43.8	18.8	18.8	10.4	8.3	2.2	0.47
Item 2: Maintain employment	44.9	15.4	16.2	10.3	13.2	2.3	52.1	31.3	6.3	6.3	4.2	1.8	-0.55
Item 3: No possess or consume drugs	77.0	15.6	3.7	3.0	0.7	1.4	67.4	19.6	6.5	0.0	6.5	1.6	-1.38
Notification Scale						1.2						1.3	-1.37
Item 1: Notify PO of changes in residence	86.8	10.5	1.3	0.7	0.7	1.2	77.6	16.3	4.1	2.0	0.0	1.3	-1.25
Item 2: Notify PO of changes in Employment	88.4	9.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.2	77.6	16.3	4.1	2.0	0.0	1.3	-1.45
Restriction Scale						2.7						2.7	0.18
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	73.6	13.5	6.8	4.7	1.4	1.5	71.4	8.2	12.2	4.1	4.1	1.6	-0.83
Item 2: DL suspended/revoked	19.0	6.0	4.3	24.1	46.6	3.7	13.0	8.7	13.0	15.2	50.0	3.8	-0.28
Item 3: Abide with impoundment	29.4	14.7	8.8	16.7	30.4	3.0	35.6	13.3	8.9	15.6	26.7	2.8	0.65

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-3. Continued

Difficulty scales based on factor	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	
Difficulty-Visits Scale						1.7						1.9	-0.45
Item 1: Allow PO to visit residence	69.0	13.0	7.6	7.6	2.8	1.6	63.8	23.4	6.4	8.5	12.8	2.1	0.02
Item 2: PO to visit employment site	64.7	9.6	7.4	8.1	10.3	1.9	51.1	21.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	1.6	-0.86
Difficulty scales based on factor													
Difficulty Standard Scale						1.8						1.9	-0.90
Item 1: Commit no new law violation	73.6	13.5	6.8	4.7	1.4	1.5	71.4	8.2	12.2	4.1	4.1	1.6	-0.83
Item 2: Report once a month	72.4	13.8	4.6	7.9	1.3	1.5	53.1	22.4	16.3	6.1	2.0	1.8	-1.74
Item 3: Answer truthfully to inquiries	85.5	10.5	3.3	0.0	0.7	1.2	77.6	16.3	2.0	4.1	0.0	1.3	-1.15
Item 4: Changes in residence	86.8	10.5	1.3	0.7	0.7	1.2	77.6	16.3	4.1	2.0	0.0	1.3	-1.25
Item 5: Changes in employment	88.4	9.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.2	77.6	16.3	4.1	2.0	0.0	1.3	-1.45
Item 6: Try to obtain employment	44.9	15.4	16.2	10.3	13.2	2.3	43.8	18.8	18.8	10.4	8.3	2.2	0.47
Item 7: Maintain employment	65.2	16.3	7.4	6.7	4.4	1.7	52.1	31.3	6.3	6.3	4.2	1.8	-0.55
Item 8: Allow PO to visit residence	69.0	13.0	7.6	7.6	2.8	1.6	63.8	23.4	6.4	8.5	12.8	2.1	0.02
Item 9: PO to visit employment site	64.7	9.6	7.4	8.1	10.3	1.9	51.1	21.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	1.6	-0.86
Item 10: Pay COS	26.0	12.0	20.0	24.0	18.0	3.0	26.5	18.4	22.4	16.3	16.3	2.8	0.78
Item 11: Court cost	20.5	13.0	15.8	26.0	24.7	3.2	20.4	10.2	20.4	26.5	22.4	3.2	0.03

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-4. Percentage for difficulty scales and variables based on the literature by group

Difficulty scales based on literature	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	
Difficulty Treatment Scale						1.8						1.9	0.83
Item 1: Submit to random screens	71.3	15.5	9.3	3.1	0.8	1.5	59.6	25.5	8.5	2.1	4.3	1.7	-1.16
Item 2: No alcohol	60.3	16.9	13.2	6.6	2.9	1.8	51.1	25.5	14.9	2.1	6.4	1.9	-0.63
Item 3: No drugs	77.0	15.6	3.7	3.0	0.7	1.4	67.4	19.6	6.5	0.0	6.5	1.6	-1.38
Item 4: Participate in alcohol treatment	49.1	17.3	19.1	10.0	4.5	2.0	37.8	33.3	13.3	4.4	11.1	2.2	-0.62
Item 5: Participate in drug treatment	48.9	12.2	17.8	18.9	2.2	2.1	51.2	25.6	7.0	4.7	11.6	2.0	0.54
Item 6: Participate in mental health TX	51.2	15.5	13.1	17.9	2.4	2.1	48.9	28.9	6.7	4.4	11.1	2.0	0.20
Item 7: Participate in employment program	50.0	28.0	11.0	8.5	2.4	1.9	52.4	28.6	7.1	4.8	7.1	1.9	-0.02
Item 8: Milepost class	53.6	10.7	12.5	21.4	2.1	2.1	53.7	22.0	12.2	4.9	7.3	1.9	0.65
Item 9: batterer's intervention	53.2	6.5	14.3	14.3	2.3	2.3	54.8	23.8	11.9	4.8	4.8	1.8	1.79
Item 10: Complete anger management	52.4	14.3	13.1	15.5	2.1	2.1	55.8	20.9	11.6	7.0	4.7	1.8	0.97
Item 11: Attend driver's course	49.5	18.1	10.5	15.2	2.1	2.1	41.3	26.1	15.2	8.7	8.7	2.2	-0.26

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-4. Continued

Difficulty scales based on literature	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49						t
	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	ND	RE	50/50	SD	VD	Mean	
Difficulty Punitive Scale						2.7						2.7	0.02
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	38.6	19.7	18.9	11.4	11.4	2.4	29.8	19.1	19.1	12.8	19.1	2.7	-1.41
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	39.5	22.7	13.4	14.3	10.1	2.3	38.3	17.0	17.0	6.4	21.3	2.6	-0.86
Item 3: Complete work crew days	29.0	18.3	14.0	20.4	18.3	2.8	25.0	20.5	18.2	13.6	22.7	2.9	-0.29
Item 4: Complete a jail sentence	22.0	5.0	10.0	20.0	43.0	3.6	24.4	11.1	4.4	20.0	40.0	3.4	0.58
Item 5: Pay restitution	23.9	13.6	15.9	25.0	21.6	3.1	29.5	20.5	13.6	18.2	18.2	2.8	1.15
Item 6: No contact with victim	53.8	11.3	10.0	11.3	13.8	2.2	59.1	31.8	6.8	2.3	0.0	1.5	3.34**
Item 7: Attend one victim impact panel	57.8	19.6	7.8	8.8	5.9	1.9	56.5	26.1	10.9	2.2	4.3	1.7	0.69
Item 8: DL suspended/revoked	19.0	6.0	4.3	24.1	46.6	3.7	13.0	8.7	13.0	15.2	50.0	3.8	-0.28
Item 9: Abide with impoundment	29.4	14.7	8.8	16.7	30.4	3.0	35.6	13.3	8.9	15.6	26.7	2.8	0.65
Item 10: Abide by curfew	42.1	9.2	7.9	22.4	18.4	2.7	37.2	14.0	14.0	7.0	27.9	2.7	-0.27
Overall Difficulty Variable	16.4	19.1	29.6	21.1	13.8	3.0	18.8	27.1	18.8	27.1	8.3	2.8	0.83

Likert Scale: Not difficult= 1, Relatively easy= 2, About 50/50= 3, Somewhat difficult= 4, and Very difficult=5

T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-5. Percentages for obstacles scales based on factor analysis by group

Obstacles scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49					t	
	N	SD	D	A	SA	Mean	N	SD	D	A	AS		Mean
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale						2.2						2.3	-0.12
Item 1: Finding time to report monthly	153	30.1	47.7	16.3	5.9	2.0	49	30.6	36.7	22.4	10.2	2.1	-0.92
Item 2: Transportation to work	141	27.0	28.4	24.1	20.6	2.4	48	20.8	27.1	37.5	14.6	2.5	-0.44
Item 3: Transportation to report monthly	152	28.9	33.6	21.1	16.4	2.3	48	22.9	39.6	27.1	10.4	2.3	0.00
Item 4: Transportation to do CS hours	143	29.4	29.4	21.7	19.6	2.3	48	27.1	31.3	35.4	6.3	2.2	0.66
Responsibility Obstacle Scale						2.4						2.7	-2.07*
Item 1: Finding a job	151	29.1	21.9	26.5	22.5	2.4	47	17.0	23.4	29.8	29.8	2.7	-1.64
Item 2: Finding a good job	149	17.4	19.5	27.5	35.6	2.8	47	10.6	10.6	34.0	44.7	3.1	-1.84
Item 3: Maintaining a residence	150	42.0	32.0	14.0	12.0	2.0	49	28.6	32.7	24.5	14.3	2.2	-1.44
Tracking Obstacles Scale						2.6						2.6	0.49
Item 1: Paying court cost	147	10.2	23.8	37.4	28.6	2.8	48	16.7	22.9	33.3	27.1	2.7	0.79
Item 2: Paying COS	151	10.6	30.5	31.8	27.2	2.8	49	16.3	28.6	30.6	24.5	2.6	0.73
Item 3: Number of probation conditions	151	25.8	33.8	25.2	15.2	2.3	47	29.8	19.1	34.0	17.0	2.4	-0.47

Likert Scale: Strongly disagree= 1, Disagree= 2, Agree= 3, and Strongly agree= 4
T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table J-5. Continued

Obstacles scales based on factor analysis	Random Subsample N=153						Convenience Subsample N=49					t	
	N	SD	D	A	SA	Mean	N	SD	D	A	AS		Mean
Punitive Obstacles Scale						2.3						2.6	-1.90
Item 1: Finding time to do CS hours	144	18.1	31.9	31.3	18.8	2.5	49	16.3	28.6	34.7	20.4	2.6	-0.51
Item 2: Finding time to do work crew	114	33.3	20.2	28.1	18.4	2.3	48	20.8	27.1	33.3	18.8	2.5	-1.01
Item 3: Paying restitution	116	33.6	20.7	25.0	20.7	2.3	46	13.0	28.3	32.6	26.1	2.7	-2.14
Living Environment Scale						1.7						1.9	-1.15
Item 1: Avoiding drinking alcohol	145	37.9	38.6	17.9	5.5	1.9	48	50.0	31.3	14.6	4.2	1.7	1.25
Item 2: Avoiding using drugs	144	54.9	36.8	6.3	2.1	1.6	47	55.3	29.8	10.6	4.3	1.6	-0.61
Item 3: Lack of family support	150	50.0	26.7	8.7	4.7	1.7	47	27.7	40.4	23.4	8.5	2.1	-1.79
Item 4: Neighborhood conditions	151	49.0	29.8	12.6	8.6	1.8	47	34.0	44.7	14.9	6.4	1.9	-2.05*

Likert Scale: Strongly disagree= 1, Disagree= 2, Agree= 3, and Strongly agree= 4
T-test of Independent Samples * p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

APPENDIX K
CORRELATIONS

Table K-1. Correlations of severity scales and personal characteristics variables

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Severity Scales and Personal Characteristics Variables								Sample
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	
Routine Condition Scale	-0.15*	-0.18*	-0.04	-0.05	-0.11	0.02	-0.11	0.07	0.03
Item 1: No new law violation	-0.15*	-0.08	-0.11	-0.05	-0.14	-0.04	-0.12	0.11	0.09
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.09	-0.10	-0.04	0.06	-0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.13	0.08
Item 3: Answer truthfully	-0.16*	-0.16	0.00	-0.07	-0.13	0.03	-0.13	0.02	-0.02
Item 4: Changes in residence	-0.17*	-0.21**	0.02	-0.06	-0.09	-0.01	-0.08	0.03	0.01
Item 5: Changes in Employment	-0.10	-0.23**	0.01	-0.08	-0.09	0.04	-0.07	0.04	-0.03
Offender Specific Scale	-0.14	-0.05	-0.04	0.02	-0.06	0.08	0.03	0.09	-0.07
Item 1: Mental health treatment	-0.08	0.01	-0.13	0.05	-0.10	-0.11	-0.03	0.21*	0.02
Item 2: Employment program	-0.10	-0.23**	0.01	-0.08	-0.09	0.04	-0.07	0.04	-0.03
Item 3: Batterer's intervention	-0.10	-0.01	-0.01	0.05	-0.11	0.02	0.03	0.05	-0.17
Item 4: Anger management	-0.12	-0.05	0.06	0.09	-0.07	-0.03	0.02	0.13	-0.14
Item 5: No contact with victim	-0.09	0.06	0.01	-0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.08	-0.06
Item 6: Victim impact panel	-0.03	-0.13	-0.02	-0.00	-0.13	0.03	-0.02	-0.17*	-0.03

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-1. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Severity Scales and Personal Characteristics Variables								Sample
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	
Offense Specific Scale	-0.21*	-0.03	-0.02	-0.05	-0.15	-0.09	0.02	0.09	0.12
Item 1: Random screens	-0.13	-0.02	0.07	-0.04	-0.09	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.17*
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.18*	0.02	-0.01	-0.05	-0.07	-0.05	-0.05	0.08	0.12
Item 3: No drugs	-0.25**	-0.11	-0.05	-0.07	-0.13	-0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.09
Item 4: Alcohol TX	-0.21**	0.01	-0.06	0.02	-0.20*	-0.09	-0.05	0.07	0.17*
Item 5: Drug TX	-0.16	0.10	-0.04	0.02	-0.17*	-0.15	0.05	0.11	0.05
Item 6: Driver's course	0.01	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-0.13	-0.10	0.05	0.03	0.03
Punitive-Activity Scale	0.00	0.00	-0.06	0.02	-0.12	0.03	0.08	0.12	-0.08
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07	0.04	-0.13	-0.04	-0.04	0.14	0.03
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	-0.07	0.03	-0.07	-0.03	-0.15	-0.06	0.03	0.14	-0.01
Item 3: Work crew	0.05	-0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.02	0.01	0.16	0.18*	-0.03
Item 4: Jail sentence	0.05	0.00	-0.13	-0.02	-0.14	0.15	0.14	0.04	-0.09
Punitive-Restrictive Scale	-0.08	-0.04	-0.02	0.03	-0.14	-0.05	0.07	0.07	0.14
Item 1: DL suspended/revoked	-0.05	-0.05	-0.03	0.12	-0.10	-0.12	-0.03	0.05	0.15
Item 2: Impoundment	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.04	-0.05	0.01	-0.05	0.08	0.05
Item 3: Abide by curfew	-0.12	0.03	-0.01	0.01	-0.13	-0.07	0.08	0.10	0.09
Standard-Financial Scale	-0.03	0.02	-0.17*	0.15*	-0.01	0.03	-0.08	-0.01	-0.02
Item 1: Pay COS	0.30	-0.01	-0.17*	0.08	0.04	0.05	-0.05	-0.04	-0.03
Item 2: Pay court costs	-0.07	0.05	-0.13	0.20**	-0.05	-0.02	-0.09	0.02	-0.03

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-1. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Severity Scales and Personal Characteristics Variables								Sample
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	
Standard-Visit Scale	-0.11	-0.02	0.04	-0.09	0.04	-0.09	0.17*	0.05	-0.03
Item 1: Visit residence	-0.11	-0.06	0.08	-0.09	0.01	-0.07	0.11	0.04	0.00
Item 2: Visit empty	-0.10	0.00	0.03	-0.07	0.05	-0.10	0.20**	0.07	-0.05
Standard-Employment Scale	-0.16*	-0.20**	0.02	-0.01	-0.13	0.04	-0.13	-0.16*	-0.00
Item 1: Obtain empty	-0.13	-0.09	-0.02	-0.04	-0.17*	0.02	-0.13	-0.16*	-0.02
Item 2: Maintain empty	-0.12	-0.21**	0.06	0.00	-0.09	0.03	-0.11	-0.14	-0.02
Scales based on literature									
Severity Standard Scale	-0.14	-0.17*	-0.07	-0.04	-0.10	0.03	-0.08	-0.01	0.00
Item 1: No new law vio	-0.15*	-0.18*	-0.04	-0.05	-0.11	0.02	-0.11	0.07	0.03
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.15*	-0.08	-0.11	-0.05	-0.14	-0.04	-0.12	0.11	0.09
Item 3: Answer truthfully	-0.09	-0.10	-0.04	0.06	-0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.13	0.08
Item 4: Changes in residence	-	-0.16	0.00	-0.07	-0.13	0.03	-0.13	0.02	-0.02
Item 5: Changes in employment	0.16*	-0.21**	0.02	-0.06	-0.09	-0.01	-0.08	0.03	0.01
Item 6: Try to obtain employment	-0.13	-0.09	-0.02	-0.04	-0.17*	0.02	-0.13	-0.16*	-0.02
Item 7: Maintain employment	-0.12	-0.21**	0.06	0.00	-0.09	0.03	-0.11	-0.14	-0.02
Item 8: Visit residence	-0.11	-0.06	0.08	-0.09	0.01	-0.07	0.11	0.04	0.00
Item 9: Visit employment	-0.10	0.00	0.03	-0.07	0.05	-0.10	0.20**	0.07	-0.05
Item 10: Pay COS	0.30	-0.01	-0.17*	0.08	0.04	0.05	-0.05	-0.04	-0.03
Item 11: Pay costs	-0.07	0.05	-0.13	0.20**	-0.05	-0.02	-0.09	0.02	-0.03

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-1. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Severity Scales and Personal Characteristics Variables								Sample
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	
Severity Treatment Scale	-0.17	-0.12	-0.02	0.00	-0.14	0.03	0.01	0.23*	0.13
Item 1: Screens	-0.13	-0.02	0.07	-0.04	-0.09	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.17*
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.18*	0.02	-0.01	-0.05	-0.07	-0.05	-0.05	0.08	0.12
Item 3: No drugs	-0.25**	-0.11	-0.05	-0.07	-0.13	-0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.09
Item 4: Alcohol TX	-0.21**	0.01	-0.06	0.02	-0.20*	-0.09	-0.05	0.07	0.17*
Item 5: Drug treatment	-0.16	0.10	-0.04	0.02	-0.17*	-0.15	0.05	0.11	0.05
Item 6: Mental health	-0.08	0.01	-0.13	0.05	-0.10	-0.11	-0.03	0.21*	0.02
Item 7: Employment program	-0.10	-0.23**	0.01	-0.08	-0.09	0.04	-0.07	0.04	-0.03
Item 8: Milepost class	-0.10	0.04	0.06	-0.05	-0.10	-0.08	0.16	0.15	0.02
Item 9: Batterer's	-0.10	-0.01	-0.01	0.05	-0.11	0.02	0.03	0.05	-0.17
Item 10: Anger mgt	-0.12	-0.05	0.06	0.09	-0.07	-0.03	0.02	0.13	-0.14
Item 11: Driver's course	0.01	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-0.13	-0.10	0.05	0.03	0.03
Severity Punitive Scale	-0.04	-0.05	-0.09	-0.03	-0.14	0.07	0.09	0.03	-0.05
Item 1: Mandatory CS	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07	0.04	-0.13	-0.04	-0.04	0.14	0.03
Item 2: CS in lieu of	-0.07	0.03	-0.07	-0.03	-0.15	-0.06	0.03	0.14	-0.01
Item 3: Work crew	0.05	-0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.02	0.01	0.16	0.18*	-0.03
Item 4: Jail sentence	0.05	0.00	-0.13	-0.02	-0.14	0.15	0.14	0.04	-0.09
Item 5: Pay restitution	0.07	-0.07	-0.19*	0.00	-0.10	-0.06	-0.05	0.03	-0.00
Item 6: No contact	-0.09	0.06	0.01	-0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.08	-0.06
Item 7: Victim impact	-0.03	-0.13	-0.02	-0.00	-0.13	0.03	-0.02	-0.17*	-0.03
Item 8: DL suspended	-0.05	-0.05	-0.03	0.12	-0.10	-0.12	-0.03	0.05	0.15
Item 9: Impoundment	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.04	-0.05	0.01	-0.05	0.08	0.05
Item 10: Curfew	-0.12	0.03	-0.01	0.01	-0.13	-0.07	0.08	0.10	0.09
Overall Severity Scale	-0.10	-0.22	-0.05	-0.01	-0.18	0.10	0.05	0.17	0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-2. Correlations of severity scales and previous criminal history variables

Correlations of Severity Scales and Previous Criminal History Variables							
Scales based on factor analysis	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Routine Condition Scale	0.02	0.04	0.03	-0.03	0.04	-0.02	-0.02
Item 1: No new law violation	0.06	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.12	-0.02	-0.04
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.07	-0.06	-0.00	-0.10	-0.04	-0.09	-0.10
Item 3: Answer truthfully	-0.02	0.04	0.06	-0.04	0.00	-0.05	-0.02
Item 4: Changes in residence	-0.01	0.06	0.02	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.00
Item 5: Changes in Employment	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.08
Offender Specific Scale	-0.03	-0.17	0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.17	-0.20*
Item 1: Mental health treatment	-0.16	-0.13	-0.03	-0.08	-0.05	-0.13	-0.20*
Item 2: Employment program	-0.08	-0.15	-0.05	-0.02	-0.03	-0.19*	-0.18*
Item 3: Batterer's intervention	-0.05	-0.18*	-0.06	0.00	0.00	-0.16	-0.15
Item 4: Anger management	0.01	-0.13	-0.04	-0.07	-0.09	-0.12	-0.12
Item 5: No contact with victim	0.02	-0.06	0.03	0.16*	0.04	-0.02	-0.05
Item 6: Victim impact panel	-0.09	-0.02	-0.08	0.02	0.01	-0.09	-0.04
Offense Specific Scale	-0.16	-0.12	-0.05	-0.03	-0.01	-0.15	-0.15
Item 1: Random screens	-0.09	-0.02	-0.08	0.02	0.01	-0.09	-0.04
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.10	-0.08	-0.06	-0.06	0.01	-0.17*	-0.15*
Item 3: No drugs	-0.03	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.13	-0.07	-0.02
Item 4: Alcohol treatment	-0.11	-0.11	-0.05	-0.03	-0.07	-0.25**	-0.21**
Item 5: Drug treatment	-0.14	-0.14	-0.09	-0.06	-0.12	-0.24**	-0.23**
Item 6: Attend driver's course	-0.16*	-0.15	-0.08	0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.05

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-2. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Severity Scales and Previous Criminal History Variables						
	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Punitive-Activity Scale	-0.03	-0.10	-0.07	-0.00	-0.14	-0.08	-0.07
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	-0.06	-0.04	-0.13	0.05	-0.07	-0.01	0.03
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	-0.10	-0.12	-0.11	-0.07	-0.15*	-0.14	-0.13
Item 3: Work crew days	-0.13	-0.13	-0.13	-0.01	-0.06	0.01	-0.07
Item 4: Jail sentence	0.17*	0.07	0.08	0.02	-0.11	-0.04	-0.01
Punitive-Restrictive Scale	0.02	-0.04	0.00	0.07	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08
Item 1: DL suspended/revoked	0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.06	-0.06	0.02	0.01
Item 2: Abide with impoundment	-0.00	-0.08	-0.03	0.07	-0.07	-0.14	-0.10
Item 3: Abide by curfew	-0.12	-0.14	-0.07	0.02	-0.13	-0.09	-0.09
Standard-Financial Scale	-0.06	-0.11	-0.12	-0.02	-0.03	-0.11	-0.07
Item 1: Pay monthly COS	-0.03	-0.08	-0.11	0.03	-0.02	-0.08	-0.04
Item 2: Pay court costs	-0.08	-0.13	-0.13	-0.07	-0.05	-0.13	-0.08
Standard-Visit Scale	-0.05	0.07	0.00	0.00	-0.07	-0.09	-0.05
Item 1: PO to visit residence	-0.02	0.06	-0.02	0.06	-0.04	-0.10	-0.02
Item 2: PO to visit employment	-0.07	0.06	0.02	-0.05	-0.09	-0.08	-0.06
Standard-Employment Scale	0.13	0.18*	0.10	-0.01	0.08	0.08	0.06
Item 1: Try to obtain employment	0.12	0.17*	0.09	-0.01	0.09	0.07	0.06
Item 2: Maintain employment	0.10	0.18*	0.12	0.01	0.06	0.10	0.08

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-2. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Severity Scales and Previous Criminal History Variables						
	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Severity Standard Scale	0.03	0.06	0.03	-0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.00
Item 1: No new law violation	0.06	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.12	-0.02	-0.04
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.07	-0.06	-0.00	-0.10	-0.04	-0.09	-0.10
Item 3: Answer truthfully	-0.02	0.04	0.06	-0.04	0.00	-0.05	-0.02
Item 4: Changes in residence	-0.01	0.06	0.02	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.00
Item 5: Changes in emply	0.07	0.12	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.08
Item 6: Obtain employment	0.12	0.17*	0.09	-0.01	0.09	0.07	0.06
Item 7: Maintain emply	0.10	0.18*	0.12	0.01	0.06	0.10	0.08
Item 8: Visit residence	-0.02	0.06	-0.02	0.06	-0.04	-0.10	-0.02
Item 9: Visit employment	-0.07	0.06	0.02	-0.05	-0.09	-0.08	-0.06
Item 10: Pay monthly COS	-0.03	-0.08	-0.11	0.03	-0.02	-0.08	-0.04
Item 11: Pay court costs	-0.08	-0.13	-0.13	-0.07	-0.05	-0.13	-0.08
Severity Treatment Scale	-0.07	-0.09	0.02	0.06	0.04	-0.14	-0.15
Item 1: Random screens	-0.09	-0.02	-0.08	0.02	0.01	-0.09	-0.04
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.10	-0.08	-0.06	-0.06	0.01	-0.17*	-0.15*
Item 3: No drugs	-0.03	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.13	-0.07	-0.02
Item 4: Alcohol treatment	-0.11	-0.11	-0.05	-0.03	-0.07	-0.25**	-0.21**
Item 5: Drug treatment	-0.14	-0.14	-0.09	-0.06	-0.12	-0.24**	-0.23**
Item 6: Mental health TX	-0.16	-0.13	-0.03	-0.08	-0.05	-0.13	-0.20*
Item 7: Emply program	-0.08	-0.15	-0.05	-0.02	-0.03	-0.19*	-0.18*
Item 8: Complete Milepost	-0.10	-0.12	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	-0.14	-0.15
Item 9: Batterer's intervention	-0.05	-0.18*	-0.06	0.00	0.00	-0.16	-0.15
Item 10: Anger management	0.01	-0.13	-0.04	-0.07	-0.09	-0.12	-0.12
Item 11: Driver's course	-0.16*	-0.15	-0.08	0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.05

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-2. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Severity Scales and Previous Criminal History Variables						
	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Severity Punitive Scale	0.06	-0.08	0.01	0.10	-0.09	-0.08	-0.09
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	-0.06	-0.04	-0.13	0.05	-0.07	-0.01	0.03
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	-0.10	-0.12	-0.11	-0.07	-0.15*	-0.14	-0.13
Item 3: Work crew days	-0.13	-0.13	-0.13	-0.01	-0.06	0.01	-0.07
Item 4: Jail sentence	0.17*	0.07	0.08	0.02	-0.11	-0.04	-0.01
Item 5: Pay restitution	-0.09	-0.16	-0.10	0.01	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08
Item 6: No contact with victim	0.02	-0.06	0.03	0.16*	0.04	-0.02	-0.05
Item 7: Victim impact panel	-0.09	-0.02	-0.08	0.02	0.01	-0.09	-0.04
Item 8: DL suspended/revoked	0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.06	-0.06	0.02	0.01
Item 9: Abide with impoundment	-0.00	-0.08	-0.03	0.07	-0.07	-0.14	-0.10
Item 10: Abide by curfew	-0.12	-0.14	-0.07	0.02	-0.13	-0.09	-0.09
Overall Severity Scale	0.02	-0.01	0.05	0.09	0.06	-0.05	-0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-3. Correlations of severity scales and current offense and probation sentence variables

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Severity Scales and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables						
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation
Routine Condition Scale	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.04	0.12	0.14
Item 1: No new law violation	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.09
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.05	-0.05	-0.08	0.02	-0.04	0.09	0.09
Item 3: Answer truthfully	0.04	0.06	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.13	0.13
Item 4: Changes in residence	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.04	0.05	0.12	0.12
Item 5: Changes in Employment	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.00	0.07	0.14*	0.19**
Offender Specific Scale	0.08	0.14	0.17	0.10	-0.05	0.24*	0.23*
Item 1: Mental health TX	-0.09	-0.01	0.00	0.09	-0.05	0.06	0.01
Item 2: Employment program	-0.03	0.01	0.06	0.01	-0.08	0.12	0.06
Item 3: Batterer's intervention	0.11	0.16	0.07	0.09	0.03	0.24**	0.29**
Item 4: Anger management	0.11	0.16	0.08	-0.01	0.00	0.16	0.18*
Item 5: No contact with victim	0.08	0.06	0.09	-0.13	-0.09	0.22*	0.21*
Item 6: Victim impact panel	0.05	0.08	0.15	-0.02	0.04	0.12	0.11
Offense Specific Scale	-0.06	-0.03	0.11	0.05	-0.01	0.08	0.06
Item 1: Random screens	-0.01	-0.00	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.12	0.10
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.08	-0.05	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.17*	0.14
Item 3: No drugs	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.02	0.13	0.22**	0.19*
Item 4: Alcohol treatment	0.03	0.05	0.07	-0.02	-0.07	0.12	0.08
Item 5: Drug TX	-0.05	0.01	0.07	0.08	-0.12	0.10	0.07
Item 6: Attend driver's course	-0.06	-0.03	0.02	0.02	-0.07	0.05	0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-3. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Severity Scales and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables						
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation
Punitive-Activity Scale	0.06	0.11	0.10	0.14	-0.14	0.03	0.06
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.13	-0.07	0.09	0.06
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	0.03	0.05	-0.03	0.17*	-0.15*	0.07	0.12
Item 3: Work crew days	0.00	0.07	0.15	0.02	-0.06	0.07	0.08
Item 4: Jail sentence	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.08	-0.11	-0.01	-0.01
Punitive-Restrictive Scale	0.10	0.10	0.18	0.10	-0.08	0.09	0.10
Item 1: DL suspended/revoked	0.03	0.10	0.01	0.04	-0.06	0.07	0.06
Item 2: Abide with impoundment	0.06	0.05	0.12	0.07	-0.07	-0.05	-0.03
Item 3: Abide by curfew	0.06	0.03	0.10	0.18*	-0.13	0.15	0.15
Standard-Financial Scale	0.02	0.02	-0.09	-0.04	-0.03	0.16*	0.14
Item 1: Pay monthly COS	0.01	0.01	-0.10	-0.01	-0.02	0.12	0.10
Item 2: Pay court costs	0.03	0.03	-0.07	-0.06	-0.05	0.18*	0.15*
Standard-Visit Scale	-0.07	-0.06	-0.00	0.05	-0.07	0.12	0.08
Item 1: PO to visit residence	-0.05	-0.03	0.01	0.07	-0.04	0.11	0.07
Item 2: PO to visit employment	-0.08	-0.07	-0.01	0.03	-0.09	0.12	0.08
Standard-Employment Scale	0.14	0.06	0.07	-0.05	0.08	0.15*	0.12
Item 1: Try to obtain employment	0.09	0.03	0.08	-0.04	0.09	0.16*	0.09
Item 2: Maintain employment	0.12	0.06	0.07	-0.05	0.06	0.10	0.11

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-3. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Severity Scales and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables						
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation
Severity Standard Scale	0.04	0.03	-0.03	-0.00	0.04	0.19*	0.18*
Item 1: No new law violation	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.09
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.05	-0.05	-0.08	0.02	-0.04	0.09	0.09
Item 3: Answer truthfully	0.04	0.06	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.13	0.13
Item 4: Changes in residence	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.04	0.05	0.12	0.12
Item 5: Changes in employment	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.00	0.07	0.14*	0.19**
Item 6: Try to obtain employment	0.09	0.03	0.08	-0.04	0.09	0.16*	0.09
Item 7: Maintain employment	0.12	0.06	0.07	-0.05	0.06	0.10	0.11
Item 8: PO to visit residence	-0.05	-0.03	0.01	0.07	-0.04	0.11	0.07
Item 9: PO to visit employment	-0.08	-0.07	-0.01	0.03	-0.09	0.12	0.08
Item 10: Pay monthly COS	0.01	0.01	-0.10	-0.01	-0.02	0.12	0.10
Item 11: Pay court costs	0.03	0.03	-0.07	-0.06	-0.05	0.18*	0.15*
Severity Treatment Scale	0.03	0.06	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.17
Item 1: Random screens	-0.01	-0.00	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.12	0.10
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.08	-0.05	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.17*	0.14
Item 3: No drugs	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.02	0.13	0.22**	0.19*
Item 4: Alcohol treatment	0.03	0.05	0.07	-0.02	-0.07	0.12	0.08
Item 5: Drug treatment	-0.05	0.01	0.07	0.08	-0.12	0.10	0.07
Item 6: Mental health Treatment	-0.09	-0.01	0.00	0.09	-0.05	0.06	0.01
Item 7: Employment program	-0.03	0.01	0.06	0.01	-0.08	0.12	0.06
Item 8: Complete Milepost class	-0.03	0.05	0.15	0.09	-0.03	0.01	0.08
Item 9: Batterer's intervention	0.11	0.16	0.07	0.09	0.03	0.24**	0.29**
Item 10: Anger management	0.11	0.16	0.08	-0.01	0.00	0.16	0.18*
Item 11: Attend driver's course	-0.06	-0.03	0.02	0.02	-0.07	0.05	0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-3. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Severity Scales and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables						
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation
Severity Punitive Scale	0.12	0.13	0.23*	0.09	-0.09	0.10	0.09
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.13	-0.07	0.09	0.06
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	0.03	0.05	-0.03	0.17*	-0.15*	0.07	0.12
Item 3: Work crew days	0.00	0.07	0.15	0.02	-0.06	0.07	0.08
Item 4: Jail sentence	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.08	-0.11	-0.01	-0.01
Item 5: Pay restitution	0.05	-0.01	0.09	-0.04	-0.08	0.08	0.08
Item 6: No contact with victim	0.08	0.06	0.09	-0.13	-0.09	0.22*	0.21*
Item 7: Victim impact panel	0.05	0.08	0.15	-0.02	0.04	0.12	0.11
Item 8: DL suspended/revoked	0.03	0.10	0.01	0.04	-0.06	0.07	0.06
Item 9: Abide with impoundment	0.06	0.05	0.12	0.07	-0.07	-0.05	-0.03
Item 10: Abide by curfew	0.06	0.03	0.10	0.18*	-0.13	0.15	0.15
Overall Severity Scale	0.13	0.10	0.20	0.01	0.06	0.17	0.17

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-4. Correlations of difficulty scales and personal characteristics variables

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variable and Personal Characteristics Variables								
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Mandatory Attendance Scale	0.13	0.12	0.04	0.02	-0.03	-0.12	-0.60	0.15	-0.01
Item 1: Alcohol TX	-0.05	0.03	0.06	-0.04	-0.07	-0.16*	-0.12	0.02	0.05
Item 2: Drug treatment	-0.05	0.05	-0.04	-0.01	-0.13	-0.22**	-0.08	0.10	-0.05
Item 3: Mental health TX	0.09	0.07	-0.07	-0.03	-0.11	-0.19*	-0.03	0.12	-0.02
Item 4: Empty program	0.15	0.12	-0.03	-0.04	-0.05	-0.10	-0.07	-0.01	0.00
Item 5: Milepost class	0.16	0.03	0.00	-0.04	-0.07	-0.07	-0.09	0.12	-0.07
Item 6: Batterer's intervention	0.04	0.10	0.09	0.07	-0.02	-0.11	0.01	0.03	-0.15
Item 7: Anger mgt	0.02	0.16	0.10	0.06	-0.08	-0.18*	0.06	0.17	-0.08
Item 8: Driver's course	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.03	-0.07	-0.06	0.22*	0.02
Item 9: Victim impact	0.11	-0.01	0.05	0.05	-0.07	0.03	-0.17	-0.02	-0.05
Monetary Concerns Scale	-0.02	0.01	-0.19*	0.06	-0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.09	-0.05
Item 1: Pay COS	-0.00	-0.01	-0.15*	0.11	0.13	0.06	-0.03	-0.08	-0.06
Item 2: Pay court costs	-0.08	0.02	-0.08	0.17*	0.09	-0.00	-0.04	0.02	-0.00
Item 3: Work crew	-0.00	0.18*	-0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.21*	0.15	0.04	0.03
Item 4: Jail sentence	-0.06	0.00	-0.15	-0.03	-0.05	-0.01	0.14	-0.09	-0.05
Item 5: Pay restitution	0.17	-0.09	-0.19	-0.09	-0.01	0.05	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06
Accountability Scale	0.04	0.19*	0.06	-0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.09	0.37**	0.13
Item 1: Answer truthfully	-0.03	0.04	0.12	0.11	0.07	-0.13	-0.10	0.05	0.09
Item 2: Screens	0.01	-0.04	0.20*	-0.09	-0.08	-0.05	0.03	0.16*	0.10
Item 3: Mandatory CS	-0.02	0.18*	0.10	0.70	0.00	-0.19*	0.01	0.12	0.11
Item 4: CS in lieu of	0.05	0.15*	0.06	0.20*	0.03	-0.18*	-0.01	0.05	0.07

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-4. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Personal Characteristics Variables								
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Drug-Employment Scale	-0.08	-0.11	0.12	-0.01	-0.12	-0.03	-0.09	-0.24**	0.05
Item 1: Obtain employment	-0.10	-0.05	0.04	0.01	-0.05	0.04	-0.06	-0.30**	-0.03
Item 2: Maintain employment	0.00	-0.06	0.12	0.08	-0.01	-0.09	-0.07	-0.13	0.40
Item 3: No drugs	-0.07	-0.13	0.12	-0.04	-0.10	-0.03	-0.07	0.00	0.12
Notification Scale	-0.10	-0.04	0.13	0.08	0.03	-0.14*	-0.04	-0.04	0.11
Item 1: Changes in residence	-0.10	-0.08	0.12	0.08	0.03	-0.11	-0.08	0.09	0.10
Item 2: Changes in employment	-0.08	0.00	0.13	0.06	0.03	-0.16*	0.01	0.10	0.12
Restriction Scale	-0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.13	-0.08	0.05	-0.09	0.05	-0.02
Item 1: No new law violation	-0.08	-0.06	0.08	-0.02	-0.08	-0.12	-0.11	-0.01	0.07
Item 2: DL suspended	-0.06	0.01	0.11	0.11	-0.06	-0.04	-0.00	0.05	0.02
Item 3: Impoundment	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.18*	0.01	0.14	-0.08	0.09	-0.05
Difficulty-Visits Scale	-0.02	0.00	0.19*	0.10	0.12	-0.12	0.12	0.09	0.03
Item 1: Visit residence	-0.03	0.03	0.19**	0.11	0.13	-0.10	0.11	0.09	-0.00
Item 2: Visit employment	-0.02	-0.03	0.17*	0.08	0.09	-0.12	0.09	0.08	0.07

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-4. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Personal Characteristics Variables								
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Difficulty Standard Scale	-0.05	-0.06	0.10	0.21**	0.13	-0.07	-0.02	-0.06	0.07
Item 1: No new law vio	-0.08	-0.06	0.08	-0.02	-0.08	-0.12	-0.11	-0.01	0.07
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.03	-0.04	0.08	0.15*	0.17*	-0.12	0.05	0.09	0.13
Item 3: Answer	-0.03	0.04	0.12	0.11	0.07	-0.13	-0.10	0.05	0.09
Item 4: Changes in residence	-0.10	-0.08	0.12	0.08	0.03	-0.11	-0.08	0.09	0.10
Item 5: Changes in emply	-0.08	0.00	0.13	0.06	0.03	-0.16*	0.01	0.10	0.12
Item 6: Obtain emply	-0.10	-0.05	0.04	0.01	-0.05	0.04	-0.06	-0.30**	-0.03
Item 7: Maintain emply	0.00	-0.06	0.12	0.08	-0.01	-0.09	-0.07	-0.13	0.40
Item 8: Visit residence	-0.03	0.03	0.19**	0.11	0.13	-0.10	0.11	0.09	-0.00
Item 9: Visit emply	-0.02	-0.03	0.17*	0.08	0.09	-0.12	0.09	0.08	0.07
Item 10: Pay COS	-0.00	-0.01	-0.15*	0.11	0.13	0.06	-0.03	-0.08	-0.06
Item 11: Pay costs	-0.08	0.02	-0.08	0.17*	0.09	-0.00	-0.04	0.02	-0.00
Difficulty Treatment Scale	0.15	0.12	0.09	-0.00	-0.05	-0.12	-0.04	0.16	0.05
Item 1: Screens	0.01	-0.04	0.20*	-0.09	-0.08	-0.05	0.03	0.16*	0.10
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.05	0.02	0.09	0.00	-0.11	-0.18*	-0.05	0.01	0.05
Item 3: No drugs	-0.07	-0.13	0.12	-0.04	-0.10	-0.03	-0.07	0.00	0.12
Item 4: Alcohol TX	-0.05	0.03	0.06	-0.04	-0.07	-0.16*	-0.12	0.02	0.05
Item 5: Drug treatment	-0.05	0.05	-0.04	-0.01	-0.13	-0.22**	-0.08	0.10	-0.05
Item 6: Mental health	0.09	0.07	-0.07	-0.03	-0.11	-0.19*	-0.03	0.12	-0.02
Item 7: Emply program	0.15	0.12	-0.03	-0.04	-0.05	-0.10	-0.07	-0.01	0.00
Item 8: Milepost class	0.16	0.03	0.00	-0.04	-0.07	-0.07	-0.09	0.12	-0.07
Item 9: Batterer's	0.04	0.10	0.09	0.07	-0.02	-0.11	0.01	0.03	-0.15
Item 10: Anger mgt	0.02	0.16	0.10	0.06	-0.08	-0.18*	0.06	0.17	-0.08
Item 11: Driver's	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.03	-0.07	-0.06	0.22*	0.02

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-4. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Personal Characteristics Variables								
	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Difficulty Punitive Scale	-0.01	0.17	0.00	0.07	-0.14	-0.06	0.02	0.06	-0.00
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	-0.02	0.18*	0.10	0.70	0.00	-0.19*	0.01	0.12	0.11
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	0.05	0.15*	0.06	0.20*	0.03	-0.18*	-0.01	0.05	0.07
Item 3: Work crew days	-0.00	0.18*	-0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.21*	0.15	0.04	0.03
Item 4: Jail sentence	-0.06	0.00	-0.15	-0.03	-0.05	-0.01	0.14	-0.09	-0.05
Item 5: Pay restitution	0.17	-0.09	-0.19	-0.09	-0.01	0.05	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06
Item 6: No contact with victim	-0.02	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.09	-0.06	-0.04	-0.24**
Item 7: Victim impact panel	0.11	-0.01	0.05	0.05	-0.07	0.03	-0.17	-0.02	-0.05
Item 8: DL suspended/revoked	-0.06	0.01	0.11	0.11	-0.06	-0.04	-0.00	0.05	0.02
Item 9: Abide with impoundment	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.18*	0.01	0.14	-0.08	0.09	-0.05
Item 10: Abide by curfew	-0.06	0.11	0.06	0.09	-0.06	-0.04	0.07	-0.01	0.03
Overall Difficulty Variable	-0.01	0.01	-0.05	0.27**	0.08	-0.15*	-0.04	-0.00	-0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-5. Correlations of difficulty scales/variables and previous criminal history variables

Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Previous Criminal History Variables							
Scales based on factor analysis	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Mandatory Attendance Scale	-0.05	-0.03	-0.01	0.21*	0.06	-0.06	0.00
Item 1: Alcohol treatment	-0.04	0.01	-0.05	0.13	0.05	-0.09	-0.02
Item 2: Drug treatment	-0.13	-0.00	-0.01	0.06	0.05	-0.11	-0.06
Item 3: Mental health TX	-0.19*	-0.10	-0.06	0.06	-0.06	-0.11	-0.09
Item 4: Employment program	-0.08	-0.01	0.02	0.11	-0.03	-0.10	-0.03
Item 5: Milepost class	-0.08	-0.04	0.02	0.18	0.05	-0.04	-0.02
Item 6: Batterer's intervention	-0.04	-0.01	-0.05	0.11	0.01	0.05	0.00
Item 7: Anger management	-0.05	0.01	0.02	0.14	0.10	0.06	0.01
Item 8: Driver's course	-0.09	-0.05	0.01	0.10	-0.07	-0.16*	-0.07
Item 9: Victim impact panel	0.02	-0.03	0.04	0.10	-0.01	-0.12	-0.08
Monetary Concerns Scale	-0.07	0.08	0.01	0.07	-0.03	0.01	0.08
Item 1: Pay monthly COS	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.02	-0.09	-0.06	-0.03
Item 2: Pay court costs	-0.05	0.04	-0.07	-0.03	-0.13	-0.10	-0.06
Item 3: Work crew days	-0.10	-0.01	-0.04	0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.02
Item 4: Jail sentence	-0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.08	-0.08	-0.01	0.01
Item 5: Pay restitution	0.07	0.16	0.01	0.21*	0.11	0.15	0.21*
Accountability Scale	-0.09	-0.04	-0.08	0.04	-0.09	-0.11	-0.04
Item 1: Answer truthfully	-0.03	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.05	-0.02	-0.01
Item 2: Random screens	-0.00	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.03	-0.04	-0.02
Item 3: Mandatory CS hours	-0.08	-0.05	-0.07	-0.01	-0.14	-0.15*	-0.90
Item 4: CS hours in lieu of	-0.10	-0.03	-0.12	-0.01	-0.11	-0.10	-0.03
Drug-Employment Scale	0.03	0.19*	0.15*	-0.02	0.12	-0.01	0.00
Item 1: Obtain employment	-0.02	0.14	0.09	-0.05	0.00	-0.04	-0.01
Item 2: Maintain employment	0.01	0.14	0.13	-0.03	0.11	0.01	0.03
Item 3: No drugs	0.07	0.16*	0.12	0.07	0.18*	0.02	-0.00

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-5. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Previous Criminal History Variables						
	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Notification Scale	-0.10	-0.03	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.08	-0.07
Item 1: Changes in residence	-0.11	-0.04	-0.00	-0.04	-0.00	-0.06	-0.06
Item 2: Changes in empty	-0.08	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.09	-0.08
Restriction Scale	0.03	-0.03	0.01	-0.00	-0.06	-0.09	-0.10
Item 1: No new law violation	-0.06	0.05	0.09	-0.02	0.08	-0.03	-0.09
Item 2: DL suspended/revoked	0.04	-0.01	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	-0.05	-0.10
Item 3: Impoundment	0.05	-0.06	-0.03	0.02	-0.12	-0.10	-0.05
Difficulty-Visits Scale	-0.05	0.06	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06
Item 1: Visit residence	-0.04	-0.00	-0.05	-0.01	-0.04	-0.08	-0.09
Item 2: Visit employment	-0.04	0.11	-0.00	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
Scales based on literature							
Difficulty Standard Scale	-0.09	0.06	-0.01	-0.03	-0.06	-0.06	0.11
Item 1: No new law violation	-0.06	0.05	0.09	-0.02	0.08	-0.03	-0.09
Item 2: Report monthly	0.00	0.01	-0.03	0.02	-0.08	-0.10	-0.09
Item 3: Answer truthfully	-0.03	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.05	-0.02	-0.01
Item 4: Changes in residence	-0.11	-0.04	-0.00	-0.04	-0.00	-0.06	-0.06
Item 5: Changes in empty	-0.08	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.09	-0.08
Item 6: Obtain employment	-0.02	0.14	0.09	-0.05	0.00	-0.04	-0.01
Item 7: Maintain employment	0.01	0.14	0.13	-0.03	0.11	0.01	0.03
Item 8: Visit residence	-0.04	-0.00	-0.05	-0.01	-0.04	-0.08	-0.09
Item 9: Visit employment	-0.04	0.11	-0.00	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
Item 10: Pay monthly COS	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.02	-0.09	-0.06	-0.03
Item 11: Pay court costs	-0.05	0.04	-0.07	-0.03	-0.13	-0.10	-0.06

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-5. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Previous Criminal History Variables						
	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Difficulty Treatment Scale	-0.06	-0.03	-0.00	0.18	0.06	-0.07	-0.02
Item 1: Random screens	-0.00	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.03	-0.04	-0.02
Item 2: No alcohol	0.01	0.05	0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.08	-0.11
Item 3: No drugs	0.07	0.16*	0.12	0.07	0.18*	0.02	-0.00
Item 4: Alcohol treatment	-0.04	0.01	-0.05	0.13	0.05	-0.09	-0.02
Item 5: Drug treatment	-0.13	-0.00	-0.01	0.06	0.05	-0.11	-0.06
Item 6: Mental health TX	-0.19*	-0.10	-0.06	0.06	-0.06	-0.11	-0.09
Item 7: Employment program	-0.08	-0.01	0.02	0.11	-0.03	-0.10	-0.03
Item 8: Milepost class	-0.08	-0.04	0.02	0.18	0.05	-0.04	-0.02
Item 9: Batterer's	-0.04	-0.01	-0.05	0.11	0.01	0.05	0.00
Item 10: Anger management	-0.05	0.01	0.02	0.14	0.10	0.06	0.01
Item 11: Driver's course	-0.09	-0.05	0.01	0.10	-0.07	-0.16*	-0.07
Difficulty Punitive Scale	-0.03	0.04	0.08	0.13	-0.07	-0.09	-0.04
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	-0.08	-0.05	-0.07	-0.01	-0.14	-0.15*	-0.90
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of	-0.10	-0.03	-0.12	-0.01	-0.11	-0.10	-0.03
Item 3: Work crew days	-0.10	-0.01	-0.04	0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.02
Item 4: Jail sentence	-0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.08	-0.08	-0.01	0.01
Item 5: Pay restitution	0.07	0.16	0.01	0.21*	0.11	0.15	0.21*
Item 6: No contact	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.06	0.04	-0.06	0.04
Item 7: Victim impact panel	0.02	-0.03	0.04	0.10	-0.01	-0.12	-0.08
Item 8: DL suspended	0.04	-0.01	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	-0.05	-0.10
Item 9: Impoundment	0.05	-0.06	-0.03	0.02	-0.12	-0.10	-0.05
Item 10: Abide by curfew	-0.05	-0.03	0.01	0.06	-0.17	-0.10	-0.14
Overall Difficulty Variable	-0.10	-0.06	-0.07	-0.05	-0.10	-0.05	-0.07

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-6. Correlations of difficulty scales/variables and current offense and probation sentence variables

Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables								
Scales based on factor analysis	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation	Severity
Mandatory Attendance Scale	-0.08	0.09	-0.04	0.15	0.06	-0.07	-0.10	0.42**
Item 1: Alcohol TX	-0.01	0.13	0.02	0.06	0.05	-0.07	-0.11	0.28*
Item 2: Drug TX	-0.03	0.09	-0.01	0.11	0.05	-0.04	-0.11	0.36**
Item 3: Mental health	-0.08	0.03	-0.09	0.18	-0.06	-0.05	-0.09	0.39**
Item 4: Employment program	-0.15	-0.02	-0.11	0.12	-0.03	-0.11	-0.09	0.37**
Item 5: Milepost class	-0.05	0.08	0.00	0.15	0.05	0.02	-0.04	0.43**
Item 6: Batterer's	-0.05	0.06	-0.05	0.13	0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.31**
Item 7: Anger mgt	-0.07	0.01	-0.04	0.12	0.10	0.06	-0.01	0.32**
Item 8: Driver's course	-0.10	0.02	0.04	0.02	-0.07	-0.08	-0.14	0.32**
Item 9: Victim impact	0.13	0.18*	0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.10	-0.08	0.32**
Monetary Concerns Scale	-0.13	-0.08	-0.05	0.06	-0.03	-0.02	0.04	0.35
Item 1: Pay COS	-0.07	-0.04	-0.00	-0.01	-0.09	-0.03	-0.01	0.11
Item 2: Pay costs	-0.09	-0.07	0.03	-0.08	-0.13	0.07	0.05	0.20
Item 3: Work crew	-0.19*	-0.12	0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.03	0.06	0.39**
Item 4: Jail sentence	-0.11	-0.09	-0.06	0.10	-0.08	0.02	-0.05	0.31**
Item 5: Pay restitution	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.11	-0.01	0.04	0.31**
Accountability Scale	-0.15	-0.07	0.02	0.13	-0.09	-0.02	-0.01	0.22*
Item 1: Truthfully	-0.04	-0.00	-0.01	-0.03	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.12
Item 2: Mandatory CS	-0.13	-0.07	0.03	0.13	-0.14	-0.03	-0.00	0.14
Item 3: CS in lieu of	-0.15	-0.11	0.06	0.05	-0.11	-0.03	-0.04	0.15
Item 4: Screens	0.05	0.11	-0.02	0.12	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.28*

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-6. Continued

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables							
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation	Severity
Drug-Employment Scale	0.10	0.13	0.06	-0.02	0.12	0.04	0.10	0.23*
Item 1: Obtain employment	0.10	0.12	0.05	-0.06	0.00	0.01	0.08	0.12
Item 2: Maintain employment	0.12	0.13	0.07	-0.05	0.11	0.04	0.12	0.27*
Item 3: No drugs	0.04	0.09	0.06	0.12	0.18*	0.08	0.06	0.15
Notification Scale	0.08	0.09	-0.02	-0.05	0.00	-0.03	0.05	0.30**
Item 1: Changes in residence	0.10	0.14*	0.02	-0.04	-0.00	-0.05	0.01	0.27*
Item 2: Changes in employment	0.05	0.03	-0.05	-0.05	0.00	-0.01	0.08	0.31**
Restriction Scale	0.12	0.17*	0.14	0.11	-0.06	0.02	-0.05	0.28*
Item 1: No new law violation	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.22**
Item 2: DL suspended	0.07	0.12	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.05	0.00	0.15
Item 3: Impoundment	0.07	0.09	0.14	0.22**	-0.12	-0.02	-0.10	0.33**
Difficulty-Visits Scale	-0.07	-0.03	-0.00	0.10	-0.04	0.07	0.02	0.16
Item 1: PO to visit residence	-0.00	-0.06	-0.04	0.13	-0.04	0.03	0.01	0.21
Item 2: PO to visit employment	-0.08	-0.07	-0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.10	0.04	0.10

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-6. Continued

Scales based on literature	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables							
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation	Severity
Difficulty Standard Scale	-0.01	0.05	0.00	0.05	-0.06	0.02	0.07	0.36**
Item 1: No new law vio	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.22**
Item 2: Report monthly	-0.07	-0.08	-0.02	-0.04	-0.08	-0.05	-0.02	0.24*
Item 3: Answer truthfully	-0.04	-0.00	-0.01	-0.03	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.12
Item 4: Changes in residence	0.10	0.14*	0.02	-0.04	-0.00	-0.05	0.01	0.27*
Item 5: Changes in emply	0.05	0.03	-0.05	-0.05	0.00	-0.01	0.08	0.31**
Item 6: Obtain emply	0.10	0.12	0.05	-0.06	0.00	0.01	0.08	0.12
Item 7: Maintain emply	0.12	0.13	0.07	-0.05	0.11	0.04	0.12	0.27*
Item 8: Visit residence	-0.00	-0.06	-0.04	0.13	-0.04	0.03	0.01	0.21
Item 9: Visit employment	-0.08	-0.07	-0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.10	0.04	0.10
Item 10: Pay COS	-0.07	-0.04	-0.00	-0.01	-0.09	-0.03	-0.01	0.11
Item 11: Pay court costs	-0.09	-0.07	0.03	-0.08	-0.13	0.07	0.05	0.20
Difficulty Treatment Scale	-0.11	0.09	-0.04	0.13	0.06	-0.06	-0.09	0.41**
Item 1: Random screens	0.05	0.11	-0.02	0.12	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.28*
Item 2: No alcohol	-0.03	0.08	0.03	-0.01	0.02	-0.04	-0.09	0.17
Item 3: No drugs	0.04	0.09	0.06	0.12	0.18*	0.08	0.06	0.15
Item 4: Alcohol treatment	-0.01	0.13	0.02	0.06	0.05	-0.07	-0.11	0.28*
Item 5: Drug treatment	-0.03	0.09	-0.01	0.11	0.05	-0.04	-0.11	0.36**
Item 6: Mental health TX	-0.08	0.03	-0.09	0.18	-0.06	-0.05	-0.09	0.39**
Item 7: Emply program	-0.15	-0.02	-0.11	0.12	-0.03	-0.11	-0.09	0.37**
Item 8: Milepost class	-0.05	0.08	0.00	0.15	0.05	0.02	-0.04	0.43**
Item 9: Batterer's	-0.05	0.06	-0.05	0.13	0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.31**
Item 10: Anger mgt	-0.07	0.01	-0.04	0.12	0.10	0.06	-0.01	0.32**
Item 11: Driver's course	-0.10	0.02	0.04	0.02	-0.07	-0.08	-0.14	0.32**

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-6. Continued

	Correlations of Difficulty Scales/Variables and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables							
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation	Severity
Difficulty Punitive Scale	-0.03	0.07	0.03	0.20	-0.07	-0.01	-0.03	0.42**
Item 1: Mandatory CS hours	-0.13	-0.07	0.03	0.13	-0.14	-0.03	-0.00	0.14
Item 2: CS hours in lieu of fees	-0.15	-0.11	0.06	0.05	-0.11	-0.03	-0.04	0.15
Item 3: Work crew days	-0.19*	-0.12	0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.03	0.06	0.39**
Item 4: Jail sentence	-0.11	-0.09	-0.06	0.10	-0.08	0.02	-0.05	0.31**
Item 5: Pay restitution	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.11	-0.01	0.04	0.31**
Item 6: No contact with victim	0.02	0.07	0.13	0.11	0.04	-0.01	-0.03	0.25*
Item 7: Victim impact panel	0.13	0.18*	0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.10	-0.08	0.32**
Item 8: DL suspended/revoked	0.07	0.12	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.05	0.00	0.15
Item 9: Abide with impoundment	0.07	0.09	0.14	0.22**	-0.12	-0.02	-0.10	0.33**
Item 10: Abide by curfew	-0.02	0.02	-0.10	0.01	-0.17	0.09	0.08	0.26*
Overall Difficulty Variable	0.02	0.04	-0.05	0.09	-0.10	-0.03	0.01	0.16

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-7. Correlations of obstacles scales and personal characteristics variables

Correlations of Obstacles Scales and Personal Characteristics Variables									
Scales based on factor analysis	Age	Race	Gender	Ethnicity	Marital Status	Parental Status	Years of Education	Employment Status	Sample
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale	-0.12	-0.02	0.01	0.10	-0.02	-0.15*	-0.12	0.02	0.01
Item 1: Time to report	-0.15*	-0.08	-0.03	0.07	-0.02	-0.10	-0.04	0.07	0.07
Item 2: Transport work	-0.09	0.02	-0.01	0.08	-0.07	-0.12	-0.13	0.01	0.03
Item 3: Transport PO	-0.07	-0.01	0.05	0.07	0.07	-0.10	-0.09	0.05	0.00
Item 4: Transport- CS	-0.14	-0.04	0.08	0.13	-0.04	-0.12	-0.17*	-0.02	-0.04
Responsibility Obstacle Scale	-0.17*	-0.02	-0.10	0.04	-0.03	0.05	-0.08	-0.16*	0.14
Item 1: Find a job	-0.14*	0.02	-0.13	0.05	0.05	0.07	-0.07	-0.23**	0.11
Item 2: Find a good job	-0.27**	0.03	-0.13	0.03	-0.08	-0.01	-0.09	-0.14	0.13
Item 3: Maintain home	-0.01	-0.13	0.04	0.01	-0.05	0.04	-0.03	-0.01	0.12
Tracking Obstacles Scale	-0.12	0.06	-0.12	0.14	0.07	-0.02	-0.06	-0.08	-0.04
Item 1: Paying cost	-0.08	0.10	-0.08	0.14	0.01	0.03	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06
Item 2: Paying COS	-0.09	0.05	-0.08	0.09	-0.01	-0.02	-0.06	-0.05	-0.05
Item 3: Condition	-0.11	0.04	-0.08	0.13	0.03	-0.11	-0.04	-0.04	0.04
Punitive Obstacles Scale	-0.08	0.01	-0.11	0.21*	0.03	0.03	-0.00	0.11	0.15
Item 1: Time- CS	-0.12	0.07	-0.04	0.19**	-0.05	-0.09	-0.01	0.06	0.04
Item 2: Time- WC	-0.05	0.01	0.01	0.21**	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.11	0.08
Item 3: Restitution	-0.01	-0.05	-0.07	0.16*	0.06	0.11	-0.07	0.06	0.16*
Living Environment Scale	-0.15*	-0.01	0.03	0.04	-0.07	-0.12	-0.19	-0.10	0.09
Item 1: Avoid alcohol	-0.07	0.06	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.16*	-0.01	-0.04	-0.09
Item 2: Avoid drugs	-0.09	-0.05	0.13	0.00	-0.05	-0.18*	-0.13	0.02	0.05
Item 3: No family	-0.08	0.04	-0.05	0.06	-0.14	-0.00	-0.10	-0.12	0.14*
Item 4: Neighborhood	-0.12	-0.05	0.02	0.05	-0.00	-0.01	-0.27**	-0.07	0.13

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-8. Correlations of obstacles scales and previous criminal history variables

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Obstacles Scales and Previous Criminal History Variables						
	Previous History	Seriousness History	Prior Violent Offense	Prior Probation	Prior Violation	Jail History	Prior Sentence History
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale	-0.17*	0.01	-0.08	-0.10	0.05	-0.02	-0.03
Item 1: Time to report monthly	0.01	0.07	0.03	-0.02	0.03	-0.02	-0.05
Item 2: Transportation to work	-0.25**	0.02	-0.09	-0.11	0.05	-0.04	0.01
Item 3: Transportation to report	-0.09	-0.01	-0.08	-0.06	0.02	-0.04	-0.09
Item 4: Transportation to do CS	-0.11	-0.00	-0.08	-0.13	0.00	-0.02	-0.01
Responsibility Obstacle Scale	-0.07	0.07	0.08	-0.13	0.02	-0.07	-0.05
Item 1: Finding a job	-0.05	0.03	0.09	-0.14	-0.04	-0.10	-0.07
Item 2: Finding a good job	-0.11	0.03	0.03	-0.18*	-0.01	-0.12	-0.11
Item 3: Maintaining a residence	0.02	0.13	0.07	0.02	0.12	0.06	0.06
Tracking Obstacles Scale	-0.11	-0.05	-0.03	-0.10	-0.05	-0.08	-0.06
Item 1: Paying court cost	-0.11	-0.05	-0.07	-0.12	-0.06	-0.04	-0.01
Item 2: Paying monthly COS	-0.13	-0.01	-0.04	-0.10	-0.04	-0.04	-0.01
Item 3: Number of conditions	-0.06	-0.05	-0.00	-0.05	-0.03	-0.13	-0.13
Punitive Obstacles Scale	-0.08	-0.10	-0.11	-0.12	-0.07	-0.07	-0.10
Item 1: Time to do CS hours	-0.15*	-0.08	-0.06	-0.18*	-0.14	-0.13	-0.12
Item 2: Time to do work crew	-0.04	-0.06	-0.01	-0.08	-0.02	-0.03	-0.05
Item 3: Paying restitution	-0.02	-0.05	-0.14	-0.02	-0.05	-0.01	-0.02
Living Environment Scale	-0.03	-0.01	0.07	-0.14	-0.01	-0.08	-0.14
Item 1: Avoid drinking alcohol	-0.07	-0.07	-0.01	-0.16*	-0.03	-0.13	-0.17*
Item 2: Avoid using drugs	0.05	0.04	0.06	-0.02	0.09	0.02	-0.02
Item 3: Lack of family support	-0.03	0.02	0.09	-0.06	-0.06	-0.13	-0.12
Item 4: Neighborhood	-0.01	-0.01	0.04	-0.12	-0.04	0.05	-0.04

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table K-9. Correlations of obstacles scales and current offense and probation sentence variables

Scales based on factor analysis	Correlations of Obstacles Scales and Current Offense and Probation Sentence Variables							
	Current Offense Type	Violent Offense	Plea Bargain	Charge Level Reduction	Violation of Probation	New Law Violation	Technical Violation	Severity
Transportation-Attendance Obstacles Scale	-0.13	-0.05	-0.01	0.07	0.05	-0.06	-0.04	0.19
Item 1: Time report	0.04	0.10	0.02	0.11	0.03	-0.01	0.05	0.32**
Item 2: Transport- work	-0.20**	-0.12	-0.11	-0.02	0.05	-0.06	-0.06	0.06
Item 3: Transport- report	-0.14	-0.05	0.12	0.10	0.02	-0.03	-0.03	0.18
Item 4: Transport- CS	-0.09	-0.06	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.01	0.03
Responsibility Obstacle Scale	0.02	-0.01	0.12	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.10	0.22
Item 1: Find a job	0.00	-0.04	0.11	0.03	-0.04	0.09	0.11	0.15
Item 2: Find a good job	0.03	-0.00	0.06	-0.02	-0.01	0.11	0.09	0.03
Item 3: Maintain a residence	0.01	-0.00	0.14	0.04	0.12	0.00	0.07	0.37**
Tracking Obstacles Scale	-0.01	0.01	0.07	-0.06	-0.05	0.07	0.11	0.12
Item 1: Pay COS	-0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.01	-0.04	0.05	0.10	0.05
Item 2: Pay court cost	0.01	0.00	0.03	-0.05	-0.06	0.04	0.09	0.09
Item 3: Number of conditions	-0.02	0.02	0.08	-0.08	-0.03	0.10	0.08	0.16
Punitive Obstacles Scale	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.16*	-0.07	0.05	0.13	0.22
Item 1: Time to do CS hours	-0.08	-0.05	0.04	0.11	-0.14	-0.04	0.02	0.24*
Item 2: Time to do work crew	-0.02	0.00	0.08	0.11	-0.02	-0.01	0.05	0.28*
Item 3: Paying restitution	0.06	0.02	-0.00	0.11	-0.05	0.10	0.15	0.03
Living Environment Scale	-0.02	0.09	0.05	0.09	-0.01	0.02	-0.00	-0.02
Item 1: Avoid drinking alcohol	-0.13	0.02	0.11	0.02	-0.03	-0.05	-0.11	0.13
Item 2: Avoid using drugs	0.06	0.16*	-0.02	0.09	0.09	0.02	-0.01	-0.08
Item 3: Lack of family support	-0.00	0.01	-0.10	0.10	-0.06	0.01	0.02	-0.02
Item 4: Neighborhood conditions	-0.02	0.02	0.12	-0.01	-0.04	0.09	0.07	-0.09

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

APPENDIX L
REGRESSIONS

Table L-1. Predicting perceived severity- total models

Variable	Routine Condition Scale			Severity Scales Offender Specific Scale			Offense Specific Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.20	-0.01	0.01	-0.12
Race	-0.17	0.22	-0.80	-0.06	0.22	-0.08	-0.19	0.21	-0.12
Gender	-0.10	0.18	-0.06	-0.24	0.19	-0.17	-0.03	0.17	-0.92
Ethnicity	-0.62	0.46	-0.15	-0.10	0.41	-0.03	-0.15	0.38	-0.05
Marital status	0.04	0.06	0.08	-0.56	0.31	-0.25	-0.28	0.25	-0.13
Parental status	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.26	0.19	0.19	-0.06	0.18	-0.04
Years of education	-0.06	0.06	-0.12	-0.01	0.05	-0.04	-0.01	0.05	-0.03
Employment status	-0.19	0.06	-0.32	0.41	0.19	0.28	0.17	0.17	0.11
Sample	-0.27	0.22	-0.14	0.01	0.17	0.00	0.04	0.17	0.03
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	0.19	0.26	0.09	0.45	0.26	0.27	-0.11	0.24	-0.07
Seriousness history	-0.01	0.04	-0.06	-0.01	0.04	-0.08	-0.02	0.04	-0.12
Prior violent offense	0.10	0.22	0.06	-0.02	0.23	-0.01	0.06	0.23	0.03
Prior probation	-0.12	0.24	-0.07	0.13	0.24	0.09	0.08	0.23	0.06
Prior violation	-0.06	0.24	-0.07	-0.08	0.16	-0.05	-0.02	0.14	-0.01
Jail history	-0.06	0.34	-0.03	-0.39	0.38	-0.27	-0.45	0.36	-0.29
Prior sentence	0.02	0.11	0.05	0.08	0.13	0.22	0.06	0.12	0.13
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense	-0.02	0.13	-0.04	-0.05	0.13	-0.09	-0.08	0.13	-0.13
Violent offense	0.24	0.39	0.12	0.30	0.32	0.18	-0.00	0.33	-0.00
Plea bargain	-0.24	0.22	-0.12	0.37	0.22	0.21	0.19	0.20	0.10
Charge level reduction	-0.02	0.26	-0.10	0.16	0.21	0.09	-0.00	0.20	-0.00
Violation of probation	0.10	0.24	-0.01	-0.36	0.24	-0.25	0.18	0.23	0.12
New law violation	0.38	0.35	0.17	0.05	0.34	0.02	0.07	0.34	0.03
Technical violation	0.07	0.29	0.04	0.20	0.27	0.12	0.14	0.26	0.07
Constant	3.09	0.98		2.07	0.71	2.44	0.74		
R-square	0.24			0.28			0.14		
Adjusted R-square	0.05			0.03			-0.07		
SEE	0.82			0.69			0.78		
df	22			22			22		
F-value	1.25			1.12			0.67		
N	86			115			125		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-1. Continued

Variable	Punitive-Activity Scale			Severity Scales Punitive-Restrictive Scale			Standard-Financial Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	0.00	0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.01	-0.17	-0.00	0.01	-0.05
Race	0.06	0.23	0.03	-0.29	0.24	-0.16	-0.02	0.20	-0.01
Gender	-0.18	0.19	-0.10	-0.19	0.20	-0.11	-0.40*	0.16	-0.19
Ethnicity	-0.02	0.41	-0.01	0.09	0.43	0.02	0.48	0.32	0.12
Marital status	-0.66	0.29	-0.23	-0.41	0.30	-0.17	-0.29	0.24	-0.10
Parental status	0.17	0.19	0.10	0.03	0.23	0.02	0.19	0.18	0.09
Years of education	-0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.00	0.05	0.01	-0.05	0.04	-0.08
Employment status	0.33	0.18	0.18	0.29	0.20	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.02
Sample	-0.14	0.19	-0.08	0.40*	0.20	0.22	-0.12	0.18	-0.05
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	0.11	0.27	0.05	0.28	0.29	0.13	-0.00	0.22	-0.00
Seriousness history	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.09	-0.03	0.03	-0.11
Prior violent offense	-0.15	0.25	-0.08	-0.20	0.28	-0.10	-0.21	0.22	-0.09
Prior probation	-0.04	0.25	-0.02	0.36	0.27	0.20	0.13	0.22	0.07
Prior violation	-0.26	0.16	-0.14	-0.16	0.18	-0.08	-0.06	0.16	-0.03
Jail history	-0.37	0.36	-0.19	-0.21	0.42	-0.11	-0.58	0.33	-0.26
Prior sentence	0.11	0.12	0.23	-0.06	0.14	-0.12	0.07	0.10	0.12
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense	0.00	0.14	0.00	-0.12	0.15	-0.16	-0.10	0.13	-0.12
Violent offense	0.26	0.38	0.12	0.40	0.40	0.18	0.29	0.36	0.12
Plea bargain	0.26	0.22	0.12	0.38	0.24	0.16	-0.28	0.19	-0.12
Charge level reduction	0.20	0.23	0.09	0.11	0.24	0.05	-0.03	0.20	-0.01
Violation of probation	-0.38	0.26	-0.20	-0.18	0.29	-0.09	0.26	0.23	0.12
New law violation	-0.04	0.37	-0.01	0.18	0.42	0.06	0.34	0.33	0.11
Technical violation	0.26	0.29	0.12	0.06	0.34	0.02	0.21	0.27	0.09
Constant	1.91	0.83		2.87	0.86		3.64	0.72	
R-square	0.16			0.23			0.16		
Adjusted R-square	-0.02			0.03			0.04		
SEE	0.90			0.89			0.97		
df	22			22			22		
F-value	0.89			1.17			1.37		
N	107			181			175		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-1. Continued

Variable	Standard-Visit Scale			Severity Scales Standard-Employment Scale			Severity Standard Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.11	-0.02*	0.01	-0.19	-0.01*	0.01	-0.19
Race	-0.19	0.20	-0.09	-0.29	0.19	-0.15	-0.28	0.15	-0.20
Gender	0.10	0.17	0.05	-0.02	0.16	-0.01	-0.11	0.12	-0.08
Ethnicity	-0.50	0.35	-0.12	0.04	0.34	0.01	-0.12	0.26	-0.04
Marital status	-0.01	0.25	-0.00	-0.14	0.24	-0.05	-0.19	0.18	-0.09
Parental status	-0.20	0.18	-0.10	0.06	0.18	0.03	0.08	0.13	0.06
Years of education	0.06	0.05	0.10	-0.04	0.05	-0.07	-0.02	0.03	-0.05
Employment status	0.14	0.16	0.07	-0.14	0.16	-0.07	0.10	0.12	0.07
Sample	-0.28	0.18	-0.12	-0.08	0.17	-0.04	-0.13	0.13	-0.08
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	-0.13	0.23	-0.06	0.16	0.22	0.08	0.13	0.17	0.08
Seriousness history	0.08*	0.04	0.30	0.04	0.03	0.16	-0.00	0.03	-0.01
Prior violent offense	-0.09	0.23	-0.04	0.01	0.22	0.01	0.01	0.17	0.01
Prior probation	0.05	0.23	0.02	-0.07	0.22	-0.04	-0.08	0.17	-0.06
Prior violation	-0.14	0.16	-0.07	0.16	0.15	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.04
Jail history	-0.57	0.33	-0.26	0.16	0.32	0.08	-0.31	0.24	-0.20
Prior sentence	0.02	0.10	0.04	-0.07	0.10	-0.13	0.04	0.08	0.10
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense	-0.02	0.13	-0.02	0.09	0.12	0.12	-0.05	0.09	-0.09
Violent offense	-0.15	0.36	-0.06	-0.21	0.35	-0.09	0.06	0.26	0.04
Plea bargain	-0.05	0.19	-0.02	-0.00	0.19	-0.00	-0.16	0.14	-0.10
Charge level reduction	0.20	0.20	0.08	-0.05	0.19	-0.02	0.09	0.15	0.05
Violation of probation	-0.11	0.24	-0.05	-0.05	0.23	-0.02	0.10	0.17	0.07
New law violation	0.47	0.34	0.16	0.41	0.34	0.14	0.27	0.25	0.13
Technical violation	-0.01	0.27	-0.00	-0.22	0.27	-0.10	0.11	0.20	0.07
Constant	1.60	0.77		2.69	0.73		2.73	0.55	
R-square	0.17			0.15			0.15		
Adjusted R-square	0.05			0.02			0.01		
SEE	0.98			0.93			0.68		
df	22			22			22		
F-value	1.39			1.16			1.08		
N	169			159			105		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-1. Continued

Variable	Standard Treatment Scale			Severity Scales Severity Punitive Scale			Overall Severity Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.18	-0.01	0.01	-0.15	-0.01	0.01	-0.19
Race	-0.29	0.22	-0.20	-0.11	0.22	-0.08	-0.44*	0.20	-0.37
Gender	-0.21	0.21	-0.14	-0.24	0.19	-0.17	-0.18	0.18	-0.15
Ethnicity	0.19	0.44	0.06	-0.10	0.41	-0.03	0.19	0.35	0.07
Marital status	-0.09	0.28	-0.05	-0.56	0.31	-0.25	-0.30	0.27	-0.17
Parental status	0.12	0.21	0.08	0.26	0.19	0.19	0.23	0.17	0.19
Years of education	0.05	0.06	0.11	-0.01	0.05	-0.04	0.02	0.05	0.07
Employment status	0.50	0.20	0.33	0.41*	0.19	0.28	0.59**	0.17	0.49
Sample	0.16	0.19	0.11	0.01	0.17	0.00	0.24	0.16	0.20
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	-0.03	0.28	-0.02	0.45	0.26	0.27	0.31	0.24	0.22
Seriousness history	-0.02	0.04	-0.09	-0.01	0.04	-0.08	-0.02	0.03	-0.13
Prior violent offense	0.12	0.23	0.08	-0.02	0.23	-0.01	-0.03	0.21	-0.03
Prior probation	0.21	0.26	0.15	0.13	0.24	0.09	-0.00	0.22	-0.00
Prior violation	0.06	0.15	0.04	-0.13	0.15	-0.09	0.07	0.13	0.06
Jail history	-0.32	-0.38	-0.21	-0.39	0.38	-0.27	-0.43	0.33	-0.35
Prior sentence	0.03	0.13	0.08	0.08	0.13	0.22	0.13	0.11	0.41
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense	-0.03	0.14	-0.05	-0.05	0.13	-0.09	-0.06	0.11	-0.13
Violent offense	0.17	0.33	0.10	0.30	0.32	0.18	0.10	0.27	0.07
Plea bargain	0.20	0.24	0.11	0.37	0.22	0.21	0.23	0.20	0.16
Charge level reduction	0.04	0.22	0.02	0.16	0.21	0.09	0.08	0.19	0.05
Violation of probation	0.20	0.24	0.13	-0.36	0.24	-0.25	0.00	0.21	0.00
New law violation	0.04	0.33	0.02	0.05	0.34	0.02	0.19	0.28	0.12
Technical violation	0.29	0.25	0.18	0.20	0.27	0.12	0.21	0.22	0.16
Constant	1.09	0.84		2.07	0.71		1.29	0.70	
R-square	0.28			0.28			0.38		
Adjusted R-square	0.03			0.03			0.11		
SEE	0.72			0.69			0.56		
df	22			22			22		
F-value	1.11			1.12			1.41		
N	85			86			73		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-2. Predicting perceived difficulty- total model

Variable	Mandatory Attendance Scale			Difficulty Scales Monetary Concern Scale			Accountability Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	0.02	0.01	0.20	-0.01	0.02	-0.09	0.03*	0.01	0.37
Race	0.57	0.31	0.29	-0.14	0.42	-0.06	0.83**	0.29	0.49
Gender	0.13	0.26	0.06	-0.19	0.35	-0.08	0.63*	0.24	0.36
Ethnicity	0.01	0.52	0.00	0.22	0.71	0.04	-0.06	0.48	-0.02
Marital status	-0.19	0.40	-0.07	-0.16	0.55	-0.05	-0.72	0.37	-0.29
Parental status	-0.21	0.26	-0.11	0.07	0.33	0.03	-0.01	0.23	-0.00
Years of education	-0.05	-0.08	-0.09	-0.07	0.10	-0.09	-0.13	0.07	-0.25
Employment status	0.17	0.10	0.24	0.27	0.14	0.31	0.19	0.09	0.29
Sample	-0.27	0.24	-0.14	-0.44	0.33	-0.19	-0.10	0.22	-0.06
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	-0.22	0.35	-0.10	0.14	0.47	0.05	-0.31	0.32	-0.15
Seriousness history	0.04	0.05	0.18	0.12	0.07	0.46	0.06	0.05	0.31
Prior violent offense	-0.31	0.33	-0.14	-0.89	0.43	-0.35	-0.35	0.30	-0.18
Prior probation	0.61	0.33	0.31	0.40	0.44	0.17	-0.38	0.30	-0.22
Jail history	0.27	0.52	0.13	-0.31	0.67	-0.13	-0.71	0.46	-0.40
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense type	-0.14	0.17	-0.17	-0.32	0.23	-0.34	-0.13	0.16	-0.19
Violent offense	0.75	0.42	0.31	0.38*	0.55	0.14	0.27	0.38	0.13
Plea bargain	-0.42	0.30	-0.18	-0.49	0.40	-0.17	-0.02	0.28	-0.01
Charge level reduction	0.46	0.28	0.18	-0.13	0.38	-0.04	0.22	0.26	0.10
Violation of probation	0.09	0.32	0.05	-0.35	0.42	-0.15	-0.00	0.28	-0.00
New law violation	-0.51	0.43	-0.19	-0.10	0.56	-0.31	-0.32	0.39	-0.13
Technical violation	-0.08	0.35	-0.04	0.72	0.43	0.28	0.19	0.30	0.10
Severity	0.95***	0.19	0.58	0.77**	0.26	0.40	0.57**	0.18	0.39
Constant	0.33	1.12		3.28	1.47	1.11	1.02		
R-square	0.54			0.38			0.45		
Adjusted R-square	0.31			0.08			0.20		
SEE	0.82			1.11			0.77		
Degrees of freedom	23			23			23		
F-value	2.30**			1.26			1.78*		
N	69			71			73		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-2. Continued

Variable	Drug-Employment Scale			Difficulty Scales Notification Scale			Restriction Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	0.02	0.01	0.19	-0.01	0.01	-0.18	-0.01	0.01	-0.07
Race	-0.05	0.30	-0.03	0.01	0.18	0.01	0.27	0.39	0.13
Gender	0.39	0.25	0.21	0.14	0.15	0.13	-0.22	0.33	-0.10
Ethnicity	0.51	0.49	0.13	-0.40	0.31	-0.18	1.17	0.66	0.26
Marital status	-0.56	0.38	-0.21	0.07	0.24	0.05	-0.55	0.51	-0.18
Parental status	-0.27	0.24	-0.15	-0.09	0.15	-0.08	0.32	0.31	0.15
Years of education	-0.05	0.07	-0.09	-0.06	0.04	-0.19	0.04	0.09	0.06
Employment status	0.41***	0.09	0.62	-0.03	0.06	-0.08	0.17	0.13	0.22
Sample	0.11	0.23	0.06	0.11	0.14	0.11	-0.09	0.30	-0.04
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	-0.05	0.33	-0.02	-0.17	0.20	-0.14	0.13	0.43	0.05
Seriousness history	0.06	0.05	0.28	-0.03	0.03	-0.25	0.09	0.06	0.38
Prior violent offense	-0.48	0.30	-0.23	0.18	0.19	0.15	-0.22	0.40	-0.10
Prior probation	-0.44	0.31	-0.24	-0.03	0.19	-0.03	0.28	0.41	0.14
Jail history	0.11	0.47	0.06	-0.06	0.29	-0.05	0.73	0.63	0.34
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense type	-0.22	0.16	-0.30	-0.12	0.10	-0.28	-0.15	0.22	-0.18
Violent offense	0.28	0.38	0.13	-0.12	0.10	-0.28	0.72	0.51	0.30
Plea bargain	-0.42	0.28	-0.19	-0.07	0.18	-0.05	-0.14	0.38	-0.06
Charge level reduction	0.20	0.27	0.08	-0.15	0.17	-0.11	0.09	0.35	0.03
Violation of probation	0.63*	0.29	0.34	0.09	0.18	0.09	0.31	0.39	0.15
New law violation	-0.93*	0.40	-0.37	-0.63*	0.25	-0.43	-0.03	0.53	-0.01
Technical violation	0.41	0.31	0.20	0.43*	0.19	0.37	-0.12	0.41	-0.05
Severity	0.52**	0.18	0.34	0.29*	0.11	0.34	0.38	0.24	0.22
Constant	0.96	1.04		2.07	0.65		1.33	1.34	
R-square	0.49			0.39			0.29		
Adjusted R-square	0.26			0.11			-0.04		
SEE	0.78			0.49			1.04		
Degrees of freedom	23			23			23		
F-value	2.11*			1.39			0.89		
N	73			73			73		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-2. Continued.

Variable	Difficulty-Visits Scale			Difficulty Scales Difficulty Standard Scale			Difficulty Treatment Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	-0.02	0.01	-0.24	-0.01	0.01	-0.12	0.02	0.01	0.25
Race	-0.92**	0.32	-0.47	-0.23	0.15	-0.24	0.53	0.27	0.30
Gender	0.38	0.27	0.19	0.17	0.13	0.18	0.23	0.23	0.13
Ethnicity	0.36	0.54	0.08	0.25	0.25	0.12	-0.07	0.45	-0.02
Marital status	0.62	0.41	0.22	-0.12	0.19	-0.08	-0.20	0.35	-0.08
Parental status	-0.03	0.26	-0.01	-0.06	0.12	-0.06	-0.24	0.23	-0.14
Years of education	0.14	0.08	0.24	-0.02	0.04	-0.06	-0.05	0.07	-0.09
Employment status	-0.12	0.10	-0.16	0.07	0.05	0.19	0.22*	0.09	0.34
Sample	0.55*	0.25	0.28	0.16	0.12	0.17	-0.22	0.21	-0.12
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	-0.72	0.36	-0.30	-0.16	0.17	-0.14	-0.27	0.31	-0.13
Seriousness history	0.04	0.05	0.19	0.03	0.02	0.26	0.05	0.04	0.23
Prior violent	0.09	0.33	0.04	-0.28	0.15	-0.26	-0.27	0.29	-0.14
Prior probation	0.63	0.34	0.32	0.03	0.16	0.04	0.44	0.29	0.25
Jail history	0.60	0.52	0.29	-0.17	0.24	-0.17	0.23	0.46	0.12
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense	-0.15	0.18	-0.18	-0.21*	0.08	-0.54	-0.15	0.15	-0.21
Violent offense	0.48	0.42	0.20	0.34	0.20	0.30	0.69	0.37	0.32
Plea bargain	-0.46	0.31	-0.19	-0.32*	0.14	-0.27	-0.40	0.26	-0.19
Charge level reduction	0.62*	0.29	0.23	0.09	0.14	0.07	0.34	0.25	0.15
Violation of probation	0.56	0.32	0.28	0.24	0.15	0.25	0.20	0.28	0.11
New law violation	0.38	0.43	0.14	-0.49*	0.20	-0.37	-0.48	0.38	-0.20
Technical violation	-0.62	0.34	-0.28	0.31	0.16	0.29	-0.10	0.31	-0.05
Severity	-0.01	0.20	-0.00	0.29**	0.09	0.36	0.86***	0.17	0.59
Constant	1.28	1.14		2.16	0.53		0.32	0.99	
R-square	0.49			0.52			0.56		
Adjusted R-square	0.25			0.30			0.34		
SEE	0.86			0.40			0.72		
Degrees of freedom	23			23			23		
F-value	2.05*			2.33**			2.52**		
N	73			73			69		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-2. Continued

Variable	Difficulty Scales					
	Difficulty b	Punitive SE	Scale B	Overall b	Difficulty SE	Scale B
Personal Characteristics						
Age	0.00	0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.02	-0.18
Race	0.50	0.30	0.26	0.80	0.48	0.31
Gender	0.01	0.26	0.01	0.03	0.41	0.01
Ethnicity	0.48	0.51	0.13	1.11	0.80	0.20
Marital status	-0.78	0.44	-0.27	-0.33	0.62	-0.09
Parental status	0.14	0.25	0.08	0.06	0.39	0.02
Years of education	-0.07	0.08	-0.12	-0.08	0.12	-0.10
Employment status	0.25*	0.10	0.35	-0.03	0.15	-0.03
Sample	-0.31	0.24	-0.18	-0.44	0.37	-0.17
Previous Criminal History						
Previous history	0.19	0.36	0.09	-0.65	0.53	-0.21
Seriousness history	0.13*	0.05	0.61	0.09	0.08	0.28
Prior violent offense	-0.51	0.32	-0.26	-0.13	0.50	-0.04
Prior probation	0.32	0.32	0.18	-0.11	0.50	-0.04
Jail history	0.11	0.51	0.06	-0.14	0.77	-0.05
Current Offense and Probation						
Current offense type	-0.17	0.17	-0.24	0.12	0.26	0.12
Violent offense	0.31	0.40	0.14	0.72	0.62	0.24
Plea bargain	-0.30	0.30	-0.14	-0.33	0.46	-0.10
Charge level reduction	0.23	0.27	0.10	0.46	0.45	0.13
Violation of probation	-0.21	0.32	-0.12	-0.30	0.48	-0.11
New law violation	-0.39	0.42	-0.16	-0.65	0.64	-0.18
Technical violation	0.30	0.34	0.15	0.67	0.50	0.23
Severity	0.67	0.19	0.46	0.34	0.29	0.15
Constant	1.77	1.11		3.88	1.69	
R-square	0.48			0.35		
Adjusted R-square	0.20			0.05		
SEE	0.80			1.27		
Degrees of freedom	23			23		
F-value	1.73			1.15		
N	67			72		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-3. Predicting obstacles- total models

Variable	Transportation- Attendance Obstacle Scale			Obstacle Scales Responsibility Obstacle Scale			Tracking Obstacles Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics									
Age	-0.10	0.01	-0.14	-0.02	0.01	-0.30	-0.01	0.01	-0.10
Race	-0.01	0.01	-0.14	-0.08	0.33	-0.04	0.25	0.30	0.16
Gender	-0.17	0.25	-0.07	-0.33	0.28	-0.18	-0.16	0.25	-0.10
Ethnicity	0.43	0.48	0.13	-0.03	0.53	-0.01	0.79	0.49	0.23
Marital status	-0.38	0.37	-0.17	0.53	0.40	0.21	-0.24	0.34	-0.11
Parental status	0.11	0.25	0.07	0.10	0.27	0.05	0.13	0.23	0.08
Years of education	0.01	0.07	0.03	-0.02	0.08	-0.04	-0.06	0.07	-0.12
Employment status	0.11	0.27	0.07	-0.26	0.27	-0.15	-0.02	0.24	-0.01
Sample	-0.10	0.22	-0.06	0.49*	0.24	0.29	-0.30	0.22	-0.19
Previous Criminal History									
Previous history	-0.17	0.34	-0.09	-0.19	0.36	-0.09	-0.49	0.33	-0.26
Seriousness history	0.02	0.05	0.08	-0.04	0.04	-0.17	0.03	0.04	0.15
Prior violent offense	-0.24	0.29	-0.14	0.25	0.33	0.13	-0.12	0.30	-0.07
Prior probation	0.06	0.31	0.04	-0.11	0.27	-0.07	0.12	0.25	0.08
Jail history	0.23	0.48	0.14	0.47	0.36	0.26	-0.28	0.33	-0.17
Current Offense and Probation									
Current offense type	-0.43*	0.16	-0.67	-0.07	0.17	-0.10	-0.04	0.16	-0.06
Violent offense	0.73	0.38	0.39	0.15	0.42	0.07	0.37	0.38	0.20
Plea bargain	-0.00	0.27	-0.00	-0.18	0.29	-0.08	-0.21	0.27	-0.11
Charge level reduction	-0.15	0.26	-0.07	0.24	0.29	0.10	-0.20	0.27	-0.09
Violation of probation	0.43	0.28	0.27	0.65	0.32	0.37	0.14	0.29	0.09
New law violation	-0.51	0.39	-0.23	-0.18	0.44	-0.07	-0.68	0.40	-0.31
Technical violation	0.37	0.31	0.21	0.04	0.34	0.02	0.68*	0.31	0.39
Severity	0.19	0.20	0.15	0.37	0.22	0.25	0.13	0.20	0.10
Constant	3.01	1.00		2.98	1.11		3.73	1.01	
R-square	0.35			0.33			0.30		
Adjusted R-square	0.05			0.04			0.00		
SEE	0.77			0.85			0.79		
df	22			22			22		
F-value	1.15			1.13			0.99		
N	72			72			73		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table L-3. Continued

Variable	Obstacle Scales					
	Punitive Obstacles Scale			Living Environment Scale		
	b	SE	B	b	SE	B
Personal Characteristics						
Age	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.00	0.01	0.03
Race	0.15	0.32	0.09	0.11	0.22	0.09
Gender	-0.05	0.26	-0.03	0.21	0.18	0.18
Ethnicity	1.22*	0.52	0.34	0.09	0.35	0.03
Marital status	-0.82*	0.40	-0.33	-0.18	0.26	-0.11
Parental status	0.40	0.25	0.24	-0.04	0.17	-0.04
Years of education	-0.08	0.08	-0.15	-0.10	0.05	-0.27
Employment status	0.21	0.26	0.13	-0.30	0.18	-0.25
Sample	0.09	0.24	0.06	0.06	0.16	0.06
Previous Criminal History						
Previous history	-0.07	0.35	-0.04	0.06	0.24	0.05
Seriousness history	0.01	0.04	0.02	-0.03	0.33	0.05
Prior violent offense	-0.08	0.32	-0.04	0.16	0.22	0.12
Prior probation	-0.15	0.26	-0.09	-0.39*	0.18	-0.34
Jail history	-0.20	0.36	-0.12	-0.11	0.24	-0.09
Current Offense and Probation						
Current offense type	-0.07	0.17	-0.11	-0.29*	0.11	-0.61
Violent offense	0.42	0.41	0.22	0.80**	0.28	0.57
Plea bargain	0.09	0.28	0.04	-0.02	0.19	-0.02
Charge level reduction	0.27	0.28	0.12	0.07	0.19	0.04
Violation of probation	0.10	0.32	0.06	0.31	0.21	0.26
New law violation	-0.73	0.43	-0.32	-0.16	0.29	-0.10
Technical violation	0.80*	0.34	0.43	0.02	0.23	0.02
Severity	0.06	0.21	0.05	0.10	0.14	0.11
Constant	2.72	1.08				
R-square	0.30			0.36		
Adjusted R-square	-0.01			0.07		
SEE	0.83			0.56		
df	22			22		
F-value	0.97			1.26		
N	71			72		

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Alachua County. (2010). *County probation*. Retrieved on April 18, 2010 from <http://www.alachua-county.org/government/depts/courtserv/probation.aspx>.
- Aldridge, M., & Eadie, T. (1997). Manufacturing an issue: The case of probation officer training. *Critical Social Policy*, 17, 111- 124.
- American Association for Public Opinion Research (2009). Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys. Retrieved on March 22, 2011 from <http://www.aapor.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ResourcesforResearchers/StandardDefinitions/StandardDefinitions2009new.pdf>.
- Anderson, E.A., & Spanier, G.B. (1980). Treatment of delinquent youth: The influence of the juvenile probation officer's perception of self and work. *Criminology*, 17, 505-514.
- Applegate, B.K., Smith, H.P., Sitren, A.H., & Springer, N.F. (2009). From the inside: The meaning of probation to probationers. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34, 80-95.
- Barkdull, W.L. (1976). Probation: Call it control- and mean it. *Federal Probation*, 40, 3-8.
- Bates, S. (1960). When is probation not probation? *Federal Probation* 24, 13-20.
- Blackmore, J. (1981). The politics of probation. *Corrections Magazines*, 7, 12-16
- Bork, M.V. (1995). Five-year review of the United States probation data, 1990-94. *Federal Probation*, 59, 27-32.
- Brennan, W.C., and Khinduka, S.K. (1970). Role discrepancies and professional socialization: The case of the juvenile probation officer. *Social Work*, 15, 87-94.
- Casper, J.D., Tyler, T., & Fisher, B. (1988). Procedural justice in felony cases. *Law & Society Review*, 22, 483-508.
- Clarke, S.H. (1979). What is the purpose of probation and why do we revoke it? *Crime and Delinquency*, 25, 409-424.
- Clear, T.R., Harris, P.M., Baird, S.C. (1992). Probationer violations and officer response. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 1-12.
- Clear, T.R., & Latessa, E.J. (1993). Probation officers' roles in intensive supervision: Surveillance versus treatment. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 441- 462.
- Crouch, B.M. (1993). Is incarceration really worse? Analysis of offenders' preference for prison over probation. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 67-88.

- Czajkoski, E.H. (1965). The need for philosophical direction in probation and parole. *Federal Probation*, 29, 24-28.
- Duffee, D. & O'Leary, V. (1986). Formulating correctional goals: The interaction of environment, belief, and organizational structure. In D. Duffee (Ed.), *Correctional management: Change and control in correctional organizations* (pp. 75-102). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Erickson, M.L., & Gibbs, J.P. (1979). On the perceived severity of legal penalties. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 70, 102-116.
- Feeley, M.M., & Simon, J. (1992). The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology*, 30, 449-474.
- Fisher, W.E. (1977). Probation and parole revocation in Wisconsin. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 2, 503-520.
- Florida Department of Corrections (2010). *Florida corrections: Centuries of progress*. Retrieved on April 13, 2010 from <http://www.dc.state.fl.us/oth/timeline/index.html>.
- Flory, C.M., May, D.C., Minor, K.I., & Wood, P.B. (2006). A comparison of punishment exchange rates between offenders under supervision and their supervising officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 39-50.
- Gagnon v. Scarpelli, 411 U.S. 778 (1973).
- Glaser, D. (1969). *The effectiveness of prison and parole system*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Glaze, L.E., & Bonczar, T.P. (2010). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2009*. Retrieved on April 7, 2011 from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus09.pdf>.
- Gray, M.K., Fields, M., & Maxwell, S.R. (2001). Examining probation violations: Who, what, and when. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47, 537-557.
- Greenberg, B.D. (1981). Probation conditions and the first amendment: When reasonableness is not enough. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*, 17, 45-97.
- Groves, R.M., Fowler, F.J., Couper, M.P., Lepowski, J.M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hardman, D.G. (1960). The function of the probation officer. *Federal Probation*, 24, 3-10.

- Harlow, R.E., Darley, J.M., & Robinson, P.H. (1995). The severity of intermediate penal sanctions: A psychophysical scaling approach for obtaining community perceptions. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11, 71-95.
- Harris, P., M., Clear, T.R., & Baird, S.C. (1989). Have community supervision officers changed their attitudes toward their work? *Justice Quarterly*, 6, 233-246.
- Holgate, A.M., & Clegg, I.J. (1991). The path to probation officer burnout: New dogs, old tricks. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19, 325-337.
- James, D.J. (2004). *Profile of jail inmates, 2002*. Retrieved on March 8, 2011 from <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/pji02.pdf>.
- Jones, M. & Kerbs, J.J. (2007). Probation and parole offices and discretionary decision-making: Responses to technical and criminal violations. *Perspectives: The Journal of the American Probation and Parole Association*, 31, 35-42.
- Kinsey, K. (1992). Deterrence and alienation effects of IRS enforcement: An analysis of survey data. In J. Slemrod (ed.) *Why People Pay Taxes*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kleiman, M.A.R., Tran, T.H., Fishbein, P., M, T., et al. (2003). *Opportunities and barriers in probation reform: A case study of drug testing and sanctions*. Berkeley, CA: California Policy Research Center.
- Klockars, C.B. (1972). A theory of probation supervision. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 63, 550-557.
- Langan, P.A., & Levin, D.J. (2002). *Bureau of Justice Statistics special report: Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994*. Retrieved on December 3, 2009 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/rpr94.pdf.
- Lawrence, R. (1984). Professionals or judicial civil servants? An examination of the probation officer's role. *Federal Probation*, 48, 14-21.
- Levin, M.H. (1983). Corporate probation conditions: Judicial creativity or abuse of discretion? *Fordham Law Review*, 52, 637-662.
- Linder, C., & Savarese, M.R., (1984). The evolution of probation: Early salaries, qualifications, and hiring practices. *Federal Probation*, 48, 3-10.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Browning, K., Skroban, S.B., & Smith, D.A. (1999). The impact of probation on the criminal activities of offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 423-453.

- Maxwell, S.R., Gray, M.K., & Bynum, T. (1999). *Probationer recidivism in Michigan: A collaborative study between the school of criminal justice and the Michigan Department of Corrections*. Retrieved on April 8, 2010 from <http://www.ippsr.msu.edu/Publications/ARMaxwell.pdf>.
- May, D.C., Wood, P.B., Mooney, J.L., & Minor, K.I. (2005). Predicting offender-generated exchange rates: Implications for a theory of sentence severity. *Crime and Delinquency, 51*, 373-399.
- Mayzer, R., Gray, M.K., & Maxwell, S.R. (2004). Probation absconders: A unique risk group? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*, 137-150.
- McCleary, R. (1978). *Dangerous men: The sociology of parole*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McClelland, K.A., & Alpert, G.P. (1985). Factor analysis applied to magnitude estimates of punishment seriousness: Patterns of individual differences. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 1*, 307-318.
- Miles, A.P. (1965). The reality of the probation officer's dilemma. *Federal Probation, 29*, 18-23.
- Minor, K.I., Wells, J.B., & Sims, C. (2003). Recidivism among federal probationers: Predicting sentence violations. *Federal Probation, 67*, 31-37.
- Moore, N.T., May, D.C., & Wood, P.B. (2008). Offenders, judges, and officers rate the relative severity of alternative sanctions compared to prison. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 46*, 49-70.
- Morgan, K.D. (1994). Factors associated with probation outcome. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 22*, 341-353.
- Morrissey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471 (1972).
- MyFloridaDefenseLawyer.com (2011). Classification of Florida crimes- Misdemeanors and felonies. Retrieved on April 10, 2011 from <http://www.myfloridadefenselawyer.com/FICriminalProcedures.html>.
- New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. (2007). *New York State probation population 2007 profile*. Retrieved on April 8, 2010 from <http://dpca.state.ny.us/pdfs/nysprobationreport2007profile.pdf>.
- Norland, S., & Mann, P.J. (1984). Being troublesome: Women on probation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 11*, 115-135.
- Ohlin, L.E., Piven, H., & Pappenfort, D.M. (1956). Major dilemmas of the social worker in probation and parole. *National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 2*, 211-225.

- O'Leary, V. & Duffee, D. (1971). Correctional policy: A classification of goals designed for change. *Crime and Delinquency*, 16, 373-386.
- Olson, D.E., Lurigio, A.J., & Seng, M. (2000). A comparison of female and male probationers: Characteristics and case outcomes. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 11, 65-79.
- Olson, D.E., & Weisheit, R.A., & Ellsworth, T. (2001). Getting down to business: A comparison of rural and urban probationers, probation sentences, and probation outcomes. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 17, 4-18.
- Palmer, E.J., Mcguire, J., Hatcher, R.M., Hounsome, J.C., et al. (2009). Allocation to offending behavior programs in the English and Welsh probation service. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 909-922.
- Petersilia, J. (1985). Probation and felony offenders. *Federal Probation*, 49, 4-9.
- Petersilia, J. (1995). A crime control rationale for reinvesting in community corrections. *Prison Journal*, 75, 479-496.
- Petersilia, J. (1997a). Probation in the United States. *Crime & Justice*, 22, 149-200.
- Petersilia, J. (1997b). Probation in the United States: Practices and challenges. *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 233, 2-8.
- Petersilia, J. (1998a). Probation in the United States: Part 1. *Perspectives*, 22, 30-41.
- Petersilia, J. (1998b). Probation in the United States: Part 2. *Perspectives*, 22, 42-49.
- Petersilia, J. (2002). Community corrections. In J.Q. Wilson & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Crime: Public policies for crime control* (pp. 483-508). Oakland, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.
- Petersilia, J., & Deschenes, E.P. (1994a). Perceptions of punishment: Inmates and staff rank the severity of prison versus intermediate sanctions. *Prison Journal*, 74, 306-328.
- Petersilia, J., & Deschenes, E.P. (1994b). What punishes? Inmates rank the severity of prison vs. intermediate sanctions. *Federal Probation*, 58, 3-8.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1990). Comparing intensive and regular supervision for high-risk probationers: Early results from an experiment in California. *Crime & Delinquency*, 36, 87-111.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. In M. Tonry (ed) *Crime and justice: A review of research* (vol 22) (pp. 281-336). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Raynor, P. (1985). *Social work, justice and control*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Robinson, G. & McNeill, F. (2008). Exploring the dynamics of compliance with community penalties. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12, 431- 449.
- Rosecrance, J. (1987). A typology of presentence probation investigators. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 31, 163-177.
- Schiff, M.F. (1997). Gauging the intensity of criminal sanctions: Developing the criminal punishment severity scale (CPSS). *Criminal Justice Review*, 22, 175-206.
- Sebba, L. & Nathan, G. (1984). Further explorations in the scaling of penalties. *British Journal of Criminology*, 23, 221-249.
- Senate Committee on Corrections, Probation, and Parole. (1990). *Criminal justice in an entrepreneurial environment: An examination of misdemeanor probation in Florida*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Legislature.
- Sherman, L.W. (1993). Defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30, 445-473.
- Sigler, R.T., & McGraw, B. (1984). Adult probation and parole officers: Influence of their weapons, role perceptions and role conflicts. *Criminal Justice Review*, 9, 28-32.
- Silverman, M. (1993). Ethical issues in the field of probation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 37, 85-94.
- Simon, J. (1993). *Poor discipline: Parole and the social control of the underclass, 1980-1990*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sims, B., & Jones, M. (1997). Predicting success or failure on probation: Factors associated with felony probation outcomes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43,314-327.
- Smith, M.E., & Dickey, W.J. (1999). *Reforming sentencing and corrections for just punishment and public safety*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Spelman, W. (1995). The severity of intermediate sanctions. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32, 107-135.
- Spica, A. (1977). The correctional novagram. *Federal Probation*, 41, 47-51.
- Stickels, J.W. (2007). A study of probation revocations for technical violations in Hays County Texas, USA. *Probation Journal*, 54, 52-61.
- Studt, E. (1978). *Surveillance and service to parole*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.
- Taxman, F.S. (1995). Intermediate sanctions: Dealing with technical violators. *Corrections Today*, February, 46-57.

- Taxman, F.S., & Cherkos, R. (1995). Intermediate sanctions: Dealing with technical violators. *Corrections Today*, 57, 46-57.
- Thibaut, J. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tomaino, L. (1975). The five faces of probation. *Federal Probation*, 39, 42-45.
- Tonry, M. (2006). Purpose and functions of sentencing. *Crime and Justice*, 34, 1-52.
- Tyler, T.R. (1990). *Why people obey the Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T.R. (1994). Governing amid diversity: The effect of fair decisionmaking procedures on the legitimacy of government. *Law & Society Review*, 28, 809-832.
- Tyler, T.R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy and the effective rule of law. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 283–357.
- Tyler, T.R. (2006). Restorative justice and procedural justice: Dealing with rule breaking. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 307–26.
- Tyler, T.R. & Huo, Y.J. (2002). *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Tyler, T.R., Sherman, L., Strang, H., Barnes, G.C., & Woods, D. (2007). Reintegrative shaming, procedural justice, and recidivism: The engagement of offenders' psychological mechanisms in the Canberra RISE drinking-and-driving experiment. *Law & Society Review*, 41, 553-585.
- United States Department of Justice (2011). *Pretrial diversion program*. Retrieved on March 8, 2011 from http://www.justice.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usam/title9/22mcrm.htm.
- Van Laningham, D.E., Taber, M., & Dimants, R. (1966). How adult probation officers view their job responsibilities. *Crime and Delinquency*, 12, 97-108.
- Von Hirsh, A., Wasik, M., & Greene, J. (1992). Scaling community punishments. In A. von Hirsh & A. Ashworth (eds.), *Principled sentencing* (pp. 368-388). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Weiss, I., & Wozner, Y. (2002). Ten models for probation supervision compared across eight dimensions. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 34, 85-105.
- Whitehead, J.T. (1989). *Burnout in probation and corrections*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Whitehead, J.T., & Braswell, M.C. (2000). The future of probation: Reintroducing the spiritual dimension into correctional practice. *Criminal Justice Review*, 25, 207-233.

- Whitehead, J.T., & Lindquist, C.A. (1985). Job stress and burnout among probation/parole officers: Perceptions and causal factors. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 29, 109-119.
- Whitehead, J.T., & Lindquist, C.A. (1992). Determinants of probation and parole officer professional orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 13-24.
- Whitehead, P. (1990). *Community supervision for offenders: A new model of probation*. Hants, UK: Gower.
- Williams, A., May, D.C., & Wood, P.B. (2008). The lesser of two evils? A qualitative study of offenders' preferences for prison compared to alternatives. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 46, 71-90.
- Wood, P.B., & Grasmick, H.G. (1999). Toward the development of punishment equivalencies: Male and female inmates rate the severity of alternative sanctions compared to prison. *Justice Quarterly*, 16, 19-50.
- Wood, P.B., & May, D.C. (2003). Racial differences in perceptions of the severity of sanctions: A comparison of prison with alternatives. *Justice Quarterly*, 20, 605-632.
- Wuensch, K. (2004). Principal Components Analysis-SPSS™. Retrieved on March 23, 2011 from <http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/wuenschk/MV/FA/PCA.doc>.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Saskia Daniele Santos earned a Bachelor of Science degree in psychology and Bachelor of Arts degree in criminology in 2003 from the University of Florida. Following two years working within the Florida prison system, she entered the graduate program in the Department of Criminology, Law and Society at the University of Florida in the fall of 2005. It was there that she earned her Master of Arts degree in 2007. She then enrolled in enrolled in the doctoral program at the University of Florida in Criminology, Law, and Society in 2007. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Florida in 2011. Her research interests include institutional corrections, community corrections, survey research, and program evaluation.